

## **Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.





# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued May 19, 1953  
For actions of May 18, 1953  
83rd-1st, No. 90

## CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,8,10,22	Land acquisition.....4	Prices, farm.....16
Education.....13	Land drainage.....23	Reclamation.....12,25
Electrification.....24	Lands, grazing.....9,21	Seed marketing.....5
Farm program.....15	Loans, farm.....17	Soil conservation..17,20,22
Foreign policy.....3	New England.....7	Trade, foreign.....18
Hawaii statehood.....14	Personnel.....2,11,19	Wheat reserves.....6

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated 1st independent offices appropriation bill. Senate committee reported bill for Commission on Foreign Economic Policy. House committee reported (May 15) Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill. Sen. Humphrey recommended increase in wheat reserve. Rep. Polk requested increase in ACP.

## SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Continued debate on H. R. 4663, first independent offices appropriation bill for 1954 (pp. 5203-24). Rejected, 30-45, a Langer amendment to strike out the prohibition against use of funds for a statistical analysis of the consumer dollar (pp. 5203-10).
2. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment S. 1870, to continue until June 30, 1954, the period during which the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel shall file a report (S. Rept. 274)(p. 5193).
3. FOREIGN POLICY. The Finance Committee reported without amendment S. J. Res. 78, to establish a Commission on Foreign Economic Policy (S. Rept. 292)(p. 5193).
4. LAND ACQUISITION. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendments S. 1857, to provide for expeditious judicial proceedings for the condemnation of lands for public purposes (S. Rept. 291)(p. 5193).
5. SEED MARKETING. Both Houses received from this Department a proposed bill to amend the Federal Seed Act so as to add sugar beet seed to the list of seeds covered by the Act, require labeling as to germination of all components of agricultural seed mixtures, provide for labeling of mixtures of vegetable seeds, require treated seeds to be appropriately labeled, etc.; to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee and House Agriculture Committee (pp. 5189, 5253).
6. WHEAT RESERVE. Sen. Humphrey recommended that the wheat reserve be increased to 30% of requirements (p. 5227).
7. NEW ENGLAND. Sen. Kennedy spoke on the economic problems of New England and recommended various types of assistance, including development of natural resources (pp. 5227-43).

HOUSE

8. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment (May 15, during House recess) H. R. 5246, the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for 1954 (H. Rept. 426)(p. 5254).
9. GRAZING LANDS. Received the Black Forest Conservation Association's (Pa.) petition opposing H. R. 4023 and S. 1491, the so-called stockmen's bills, and favoring H. R. 4268 and S. 1509, relating to the use of national forest grazing lands (p. 5254).
10. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Debate on this bill was postponed until today, and the House adjourned early in memory of the late Rep. Hull.

BILLS INTRODUCED

11. PERSONNEL. S. 1926, by Sen. Smith, N. J., to remove certain inequities by fixing the hours of work and overtime pay practices in the case of certain U. S. employees; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee (p. 5193).
12. RECLAMATION. H. R. 5250, by Rep. Krueger, to provide that the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to lands in the Heart Division of the Missouri River Basin project; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 5254).
13. EDUCATION. H. R. 5249, by Rep. Cederburg, to amend the laws relating to Federal aid to education in Federally affected areas; to Education and Labor Committee (p. 5254).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

14. HAWAII STATEHOOD. Del. Farrington inserted two newspaper articles favoring statehood for Hawaii (pp. A2848-50).
15. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Engle inserted the poll results in his district on 19 issues, including farm questions (pp. A2825-6).
16. FARM PRICES. Sen. Humphrey inserted speeches by Sens. Kerr and Murray discussing the drop in farm prices and the present price-support situation (p. A2832).
17. FARM LOANS; SOIL CONSERVATION. Extension of remarks of Sen. Johnson, Tex., praising the work of FHA and SCS (pp. A2837-8).
18. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Bailey inserted the statement of O. R. Strackbein, National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, "The Import Quota: Suitable Instrument of a Liberal Trade Policy" (pp. A2839-41).  
Rep. Gross inserted a Georgia Farmers' Market Bulletin article blaming the "free trade policy" for the present farm surpluses (pp. A2857-8).
19. PERSONNEL. Sen. Lehman inserted a New York Times editorial pointing out the vital roles played by Government employees (p. A2841).
20. SOIL CONSERVATION. Rep. Thompson inserted an essay by a high school student, "How Soil Conservation Benefits Every Individual in My Community" (p. A2841).
21. GRAZING LANDS. Rep. Patten inserted a cattlemen's letter discussing the multiple uses of national forest lands and favoring the so-called stockmen's bill (p.



# DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGEN- CIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

MAY 15, 1953.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State  
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. BUSBEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the  
following

## REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 5246]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, The National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board including The National Railroad Adjustment Board, The Railroad Retirement Board, and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

The budget estimates forming the primary bases of consideration by the Committee will be found in the budget for 1954 on the following pages:

	<i>Pages</i>
Department of Labor.....	818 to 836, inclusive
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	202 to 265, “
National Labor Relations Board.....	127 to 128, “
National Mediation Board.....	128 to 129, “
Railroad Retirement Board.....	131 to 133, “
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	112 to 113, “

The detailed tabulation at the end of this report reflects each amount included in the bill for 1954, the corresponding budget estimate, and the amounts available for the fiscal year 1953, with appropriate comparisons.

## SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND APPROPRIATIONS

The requests from the agencies for which funds are provided in the bill totaled \$2,098,062,861, a decrease of \$156,718,439 from the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1953. The committee has reduced the total requests by \$132,481,291 and recommends a total appropriation of \$1,965,581,570, which is \$289,199,730 less than the amount appropriated for 1953. The bill includes \$1,340,000,000, two thirds of the total amount, for grants to States for public assistance. Payments under this appropriation are required by law and are subject to no control through appropriations unless the law is changed. The committee made reductions only in instances where it honestly believed such reductions would be effective in saving Federal funds, and has therefore made no reduction in the request for this item.

Leaving out of consideration the uncontrollable item of grants for public assistance, the committee reduced the total amount requested by over 17 percent, and the amount included in the bill is 31 percent below the amount appropriated for 1953. In addition to these savings, the committee is recommending the rescission of over \$20,000,000 in appropriations for prior years which, in the opinion of the committee, have proven to be in excess of the needs for which the appropriations were made.

*Summary of the bill*

Department or agency	Appropriations, 1953	Budget estimates, 1954	Bill for 1954	Bill for 1954 compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1953	Budget estimates, 1954
Department of Labor.....	\$256,613,539	\$296,818,600	\$254,424,000	—\$2,189,539	—\$42,394,600
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	1,984,590,261	1,786,528,761	1,697,883,570	—286,706,691	—88,645,191
National Labor Relations Board.....	9,000,000	9,800,000	9,000,000	—	—800,000
National Mediation Board.....	1,130,000	1,168,000	1,064,000	—66,000	—104,000
Railroad Retirement Board.....	[6,207,000]	[6,400,000]	[6,207,000]	[-----]	[—193,000]
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	3,447,500	3,747,500	3,210,000	—237,500	—537,500
Total.....	2,254,781,300	2,098,062,861	1,965,581,570	—289,199,730	—132,481,291

## UP-GRADING

The committee is very much concerned with the general tendency in both the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare continually to up-grade jobs and to apply reductions in personnel primarily in the lower grades. It was found that there are several bureaus in these Departments that have more than doubled the percent of personnel in the top civil service grades during the past five years, and in one bureau the number of positions in the five top grades was five times as great in 1952 as in 1947 even though the total number of jobs decreased. If this trend continues, the committee will give serious consideration to placing a limitation in the bill next year to force correction.

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The total appropriations recommended for the Department of Labor is almost exactly equal to the amount appropriated for 1953. The committee has made sufficient reductions in other activities to counter-

balance the necessary additional expenses of unemployment compensation payments to veterans which are mandatory under the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

The budget for the various bureaus and offices of the Department of Labor included \$1,494,000 for activities previously financed with funds appropriated under the authority of the Defense Production Act of 1950. The principal argument advanced for consolidating the two types of appropriations is that it is impossible in most cases to distinguish between the work done under regular appropriations and the work done with Defense Production Act funds. In the words of one bureau chief, "\* \* \* in our particular program that was a supplemental more than it was defense production, because it is just impossible to separate our general work and say that some of it is a peacetime operation and the other is defense or wartime." The reasons for this consolidation were as valid a year ago and two years ago as they are today. The only real change is that the outlook for getting such appropriations under the Defense Production Act were rather good then but must have appeared quite dim at the time the 1954 budget was being prepared. The committee has allowed none of the increases requested in the regular appropriation items due to comparative transfers from the Defense Production activities. Any activities, previously provided for under Defense Production Act appropriations, that are necessary in 1954 can be performed with the funds provided in the bill.

#### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$1,250,000, a reduction of \$335,000 from the request, \$413,000 from the total appropriations for 1953, and \$126,000 from the regular 1953 appropriation not including Defense Production Act funds.

#### OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$1,350,000, a reduction of \$414,600 from the request and from the appropriation for 1953.

#### BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$624,000, a reduction of \$374,000 below the request and \$214,000 below the total appropriations for 1953. The amount recommended is the same as the regular 1953 appropriation. No funds have been allowed for increased activity in the field of migratory labor, nor has the committee approved any part of the request for \$214,000 for activities previously financed by funds appropriated under authority of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

#### BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$300,000, a reduction of \$46,000 from the request and an increase of \$14,300 above the appropriation for 1953. A small increase has been allowed in recognition of the fact that the number of returning Korean veterans has increased.



## BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$2,700,000, a reduction of \$700,000 from the request and \$669,000 from the total appropriations for 1953. The amount recommended is exactly the same as the regular appropriation for 1953. The committee has disallowed the request for \$502,000 for activities previously financed by funds appropriated under the Defense Production Act of 1950, and funds for an increase in activities previously financed by the regular appropriation.

## BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$5,100,000, a reduction of \$767,000 from the request and \$579,000 from the total appropriations for 1953. The amount allowed is \$37,000 more than the amount appropriated for this work in the regular Department of Labor appropriations for 1953, not including Defense Production Act funds.

*Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration.*—The bill includes \$187,300,000, a reduction of \$30,700,000 from the request and \$9,810,000 from the amount appropriated for 1953. The reduction is slightly larger than is apparent since the recommended amount contains a \$10,000,000 contingency fund whereas the latest informal estimate of the Department is that practically all of the \$197,110,000 appropriated for 1953 will be expended. The amount recommended is based on the assumption of workload continuing at the 1953 level, but with the \$10,000,000 contingency fund being available to the extent necessary for additional workload, if any, resulting from changes in State laws, increased unemployment or other factors.

*Unemployment compensation for veterans.*—The bill includes \$41,000,000, a reduction of \$6,000,000 from the original request and an increase of \$13,800,000 over the amount appropriated for 1953. Payments to eligible veterans are made in accordance with mathematical formulas established by the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. Since there is no administrative control over these payments, the committee has included the amount most recently estimated by the Department to be necessary for this purpose.

*Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program.*—The committee has serious misgivings about this program, which guarantees to foreign agricultural workers coming into this country many things such as medical care for sickness or injury incurred on the job, minimum wages, adequate living quarters, etc., which are not guaranteed to our own citizens. It provides a labor recruitment program for farmers in one part of our country, while farmers on our East Coast pay for their own recruitment of laborers from outside the Continental United States. However, in view of the recent approval of an extension of the basic legislation by a large majority of the House of Representatives, the committee is recommending a continuation of appropriations.

The bill includes \$1,150,000 for the first six months' operation of the program, plus \$100,000 for program liquidation if the agreement with Mexico, which expires December 31, 1953, is not extended. This is a reduction of \$490,000 from the request. No comparable figures for 1953 are shown in the budget. The amount allowed is \$314,000 over the amount requested by the Department for the activity, "Supplying foreign-labor requirements", which is the principal activity carried on under this appropriation, and should be quite ample for the operation of the program.

## BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$2,000,000, a reduction of \$180,000 from the request and \$221,100 from the appropriation for 1953. The reduction in the number of Federal employees in 1954 will tend to result in some decrease in the workload of this bureau.

## BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$5,250,000, a decrease of \$689,000 from the request and \$529,000 from the appropriations for 1953. The committee specifically disallows the requested increase for housing and public construction statistics and directs that none of the decrease be applied against activities necessary to maintain the validity of the consumer price index beyond reasonable question.

## WOMEN'S BUREAU

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$300,000, a reduction of \$60,000 from the request and from the 1953 appropriation.

## WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$6,000,000, a reduction of \$1,639,000 below the request and \$1,639,139 below the amount appropriated for 1953. The committee was informed that about half of the investigations made by this agency are "new establishments" and "selected" and that less than one-fourth are as a result of complaints. Information was also submitted to the committee which showed that complaints received during the first six months of 1953 were 25 percent below the comparable period last year. The amount provided will be sufficient to permit the Division to investigate all complaints thoroughly and to make at least as many additional investigations as are necessary to enforce the law properly.

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The bill contains \$1,697,883,570, composed of \$1,340,000,000 for grants to States for public assistance and \$357,883,570 for other activities of the Department. The amount included is \$88,645,191 below the request and \$286,706,691 below the 1953 appropriation. No reduction was made in the \$1.34 billion for public assistance, since the basic legislation establishes mathematically the amounts which must be paid to States from this appropriation. The reductions made in the remaining items amount to approximately 25 percent of the request and 80 percent of the 1953 appropriations. A large part of the reduction from the 1953 amount is due to the fact that \$195,000,000 was appropriated last year for school construction and there was no request for further funds for 1954.

## TRAVEL TO MEETINGS

It has come to the attention of the Committee from several sources that officials of some of the bureaus of this Department do entirely too much traveling to attend meetings and conventions. Perhaps the most notable example was the plan of the Office of Education

to send 40 employees to a convention in Atlantic City. This was brought out in the hearings on the Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1953. There are instances when the attendance at conventions is important to the proper conduct of the work of these Federal officials but, due to the gross abuse of the authority previously extended, the Committee has included a limitation in the bill to prohibit the expenditure of more than \$25,000 for this purpose.

#### AUTOMOBILES

The committee has disallowed all requests for authority to purchase automobiles, either as additions to the fleet or as replacements. The committee is convinced that the Department, and especially the Public Health Service, has far more automobiles than are necessary. The Public Health Service automobiles are listed, starting on page 649 of the hearings, with pertinent information concerning each. In order that those officials that need automobiles in the conduct of their official duties may have them, the committee has included language in the bill authorizing the Secretary to transfer automobiles between appropriations.

#### PUBLICATIONS

The committee strongly urges the new Secretary to maintain a closer control over the publications of the Department than has been maintained in the past. Not only is the volume of publications greater than legitimate demand or need, but, in many instances, the contents leave much to be desired. In the Office of Education especially, more importance should be placed on objectivity. As an example, that Office's publications regarding international organizations affiliated with the United Nations paint such a rosy picture that one whose information was limited to these publications would gain the impression that the millennium in international affairs had almost arrived.

Assuming education is the science of teaching truthfully, factually, and, above everything else, objectively, one cannot help questioning the manner in which the publications regarding the United Nations has been handled.

Conceding that the United States and fifty-nine other countries are members of the United Nations, and that millions of people are hoping that it will some day restore peace, we are nevertheless confronted with the realization that experience has proved that there are many weaknesses in the organizational structure. Furthermore, there are millions of people in the United States today who are hoping that the deficiencies that have been brought to light, or exposed, will be corrected when the United Nations Charter is subject to revision in 1955.

It is an indictment of the former Commissioner of Education that he would permit the Office to propagandize one side of a question as controversial as the United Nations, completely excluding the other side.

To help the committee in keeping abreast of improvements in the Department's publication activities, it is requested that one copy of each new publication issued for release to the public and one copy of each press release and radio script be sent to the committee.



## TRANSFER AUTHORITY

The budget for the Department included requests for authority to transfer funds between specific appropriations, to transfer activities and funds from elsewhere in the Department to the central office working fund, and to use construction funds for salaries and expenses without limitation. The committee was somewhat disappointed in the new Secretary when she requested all of such authority sought by her predecessor and in addition requested the committee to give her general authority to transfer up to 5 percent between any appropriations made to the Department. The committee is not disposed to relinquish the Congressional prerogative of determining the amount of funds to be spent for a given activity and the agency which is to spend such funds. The authority of this type has been disallowed, except in a very few special cases where it is necessary for efficient operation under the existing appropriation structure.

## FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$5,000,000, a reduction of \$663,000 from the estimate and \$600,000 from the appropriation for 1953. This bureau is one of the outstanding examples of up-grading discussed earlier in the report. The table on page 1389 of the hearings shows that, while the total employment dropped slightly from 1947 to 1952 the number of positions in the civil service grades G. S. 14 and above actually increased from 12 in 1947 to 59 in 1952. If the work output of the employees increases proportionately with the up-grading, the amount of the appropriation recommended will be more than adequate for this activity.

## FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$2,750,000, a reduction of \$446,000 from the request and \$110,750 from the appropriation for 1953. The amount allowed includes funds for necessary repairs and improvements. For the last few years this committee has taken every means short of a limitation in the appropriation language to encourage the Hospital and the nearby cities and counties to work out satisfactory fiscal arrangements whereby the Hospital would be reimbursed for the care of persons who are the legal responsibility of these cities and counties as the District of Columbia is required to do in the case of its residents. So far, practically no progress has been made and the Hospital continues to assume the responsibilities of these counties and cities, with reimbursements amounting to a very small percentage of the cost. The committee has therefore included language in the bill which will correct this situation and will, along with other factors, permit the Hospital to maintain its present or better standards within the amount of Federal funds provided in the bill.

*Facilities planning.*—The committee has disallowed the entire \$50,000 for this project. There was no appropriation for this purpose in 1953.

## HOWARD UNIVERSITY

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$2,240,000, a reduction of \$510,000 from the request and \$435,000 from the appropriation for 1953. The enrollment at the University has dropped every year since

1948. The estimated gross enrollment for 1953 is only 62 percent of the comparable figure for 1948. The amount provided in the bill is approximately 10 percent more than provided in 1948. Even allowing for increased salaries and other costs this is a liberal appropriation.

*Plans and specifications.*—The bill contains no amount for this activity. This is a reduction of \$55,000 from the request and \$30,000 from the 1953 appropriation. Including balances carried forward from prior years, a total of \$274,872 is available for the two years 1953 and 1954, which the committee believes to be sufficient for any necessary activities of this kind.

*Construction of buildings.*—The bill includes \$20,000, a reduction of \$150,000 from the estimate and \$260,221 from the appropriation for 1953. Funds are included for a new vacuum pump for the steam distribution system. The committee has disallowed funds for an additional turbo generator, with the thought that any requirements for electrical power that cannot be filled by the present plant should be secured commercially. The committee lacks the technical knowledge that is apparently necessary to understand why it is so much cheaper for St. Elizabeths Hospital to purchase power commercially that they recently took out their generators and sold them, and so much cheaper for Howard University to generate their own electricity that they should buy additional generating equipment.

*Construction of buildings (liquidation of contract authorization).*—The bill includes no funds for this purpose. This is a reduction of \$1,900,000 from the request and \$1,061,779 from the appropriation for 1953. The committee was advised that no funds would be required under the Bureau of the Budget "freeze order" placed on construction on which a substantial start had not already been made. The committee desires that the Bureau of the Budget not lift this order unless there are compelling reasons for so doing that have not yet been called to the committee's attention. It is difficult to reason that a continuing expansion of the physical plant is necessary when the enrollment has been substantially decreasing.

#### OFFICE OF EDUCATION

*Promotion and further development of vocational education.*—The bill includes \$16,048,870, a reduction of \$2,624,391 from the request and from the appropriation for 1953. No funds are included for "distributive education"; thus the reduction in the remaining categories, i. e., "agriculture", "trades and industry", and "home economics" amounts to \$2,174,391, or less than 10 percent of the Federal appropriation including the permanent appropriation of over \$7,000,000 which the committee recommends be continued for 1954. The committee is in agreement with the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary in their belief that this program has matured to the point where its "promotion and further development" should gradually be turned over to the States. After hearing formal testimony which occupies over 200 pages of the printed hearings, and carefully studying the information and opinions submitted informally by many others, the committee decided that the reduction of 25 percent for 1954 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Department might be more than could be absorbed by the States and communities without damaging the program. In its desire to make certain the program



would not be retarded at this time, the committee has been far more generous with this activity than with most other programs provided for in the bill. The amount of the reduction is less than 2 percent of the total funds provided for this program from all sources.

*Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts.*—The bill includes no amount for this item. This is a reduction of \$2,501,500 from the estimate and \$2,480,000 from the 1953 appropriation. The committee recommends the continuation in 1954 of the permanent appropriation of \$2,550,000. This appropriation was initiated in the depression year 1935 and, so far as the committee can determine, has been continued from year to year with very little discussion or thought as to its continued need. The fiscal year 1951 was the last year for which the Department was able to furnish the committee final statistics on the financing of the land-grant colleges. These statistics showed separately 12 different specific sources of Federal funds and in addition indicated four general categories of income from Federal sources that evidently included more than one separate source in each. The reduction in this appropriation amounts to less than one-half of 1 percent of the total income of the land-grant colleges, not including funds for capital outlay.

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$2,500,000, a reduction of \$750,000 from the request and \$460,000 from the appropriation for 1953. This allowance will provide sufficient funds for the Office to render technical educational advice and assistance to the Veterans Administration as provided for in the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, but does not provide for the establishment of a new, separate Division for this purpose, as proposed in the Budget justifications presented to the committee. It is the desire of the committee that no substantial reduction be made in the funds budgeted for the school assistance programs in view of the back-log of work and need for additional checking of the validity of applications for funds.

*Payments to school districts.*—The bill includes \$60,500,000, a reduction of \$9,500,000 from the request but no reduction from the appropriation for 1953. The committee is convinced that the major part of these funds go to school districts where the State and community could adequately provide for the education of their children without the aid of this appropriation but under Public Law 874 there is no way of reducing the amount for such schools without penalizing those districts that really need and deserve Federal assistance. The committee earnestly hopes that the Department and the proper legislative committees of Congress will recommend legislation in the near future that will correct this situation.

#### OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

*Payments to States.*—The bill includes \$20,600,000, a reduction of \$2,400,000 from the request and \$1,650,000 from the appropriation for 1953. The committee has long thought that this was an excellent program, but serious doubts have been cast on this assumption by the failure of States to support this activity. The committee has strongly urged greater State support and, according to the testimony of officials of the Office, they have done likewise but the States still are only contributing 34 cents of each dollar spent on the program. If a better

basic law is required to correct this situation, the Department is urged to take prompt action in making recommendations to the proper legislative committees.

Serious doubts as to the proper administration of the program were raised by reports of the committee's investigation staff regarding maladministration of these funds. From many illustrative cases brought to the attention of the committee, a very few examples are cited of specific expenditures that seem very questionable:

College education for a young man who had lost three toes on his right foot but who, despite his vocational handicap, became the Eastern Intercollegiate wrestling champion while being rehabilitated.

Spending \$1,443 to rehabilitate a minister whose only disability consisted of squinting and slight nervousness.

Payment for cataract operations and hospitalization for 74 and 80 year old housewives who had been on public assistance for a number of years.

These and many other similar cases of maladministration by the State administrators have been brought to the attention of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation with absolutely no action taken on the part of that Office to force restitution of the Federal funds involved. The committee has cause to wonder if the Director is not more interested in getting the maximum amount of Federal funds for the States than she is in making certain that the Federal funds are properly utilized.

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$500,000, a reduction of \$225,000 from the request and \$200,000 from the appropriations for 1953. The committee desires that none of this reduction be applied against the activity, "Approval of State plans and grants."

#### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The bill includes \$207,090,200 for the Public Health Service, a reduction of \$63,802,800 from the request and \$77,447,050 from the appropriation for 1953. The major part of the reduction has been made in the field of grants to States and technical assistance to States. Funds for grants to States were requested under 10 different appropriations totaling about \$130,000,000. The total funds requested for technical assistance to States (under 11 different appropriations) were intended to support 2,920 positions or an average of about 60 per State. It is the belief of the committee that much of the grant funds go to provide services that are strictly a State and local responsibility and that action should be taken during the next few years to return the financial responsibility to the States and localities. In making its recommendations, the committee has recognized and made allowance for the fact that this transition cannot be made completely in one year without serious impairment of important activities. In keeping with its belief that medical research is a field in which the Federal Government, rather than the State and local governments, does have the primary responsibility, the bill includes more funds for these activities than were provided in the appropriations for 1953. Additional details by individual appropriation are set forth below.

*Venereal diseases.*—The bill includes \$5,000,000, a reduction of \$3,325,000 from the request and \$4,800,000 from the appropriation



for 1953. Great advances have been made during the last several years in the treatment and eradication of these diseases. The Public Health Service deserves a great deal of the credit for these advances, however, the committee believes that the point has been reached where the States and communities can take care of the problem with a minimum of assistance from the Federal Government. The committee has not allowed requested authority to use these funds for transportation and subsistence of patients and their attendants, recreational supplies and equipment for treatment centers and other similar expenses.

*Tuberculosis.*—The bill includes \$5,725,000, a reduction of \$1,920,000 from the request and \$2,515,000 from the appropriation for 1953. The request included \$5,300,000 for grants to States, which amounts to approximately 3 percent of all funds the States and local health agencies spend for this general purpose. The reduction in Federal funds therefore amounts to approximately 1 percent of the total.

*Assistance to States, general.*—The bill includes \$13,250,000, a reduction of \$3,065,000 from the request and \$2,950,000 from the appropriation for 1953. As the name implies, these funds are for general assistance to provide State and local public health services. It is the view of the committee that this is a State and local responsibility. The committee has not disallowed all funds in one year since such drastic action might result in discontinuance of vital activities before the State and local governments could adjust their finances to assume this responsibility. With a portion of the reduction being applied against technical assistance to States, the reduction in funds for grants will amount to approximately 2 percent of the total funds estimated to be available for this purpose.

*Communicable diseases.*—The bill includes \$5,000,000, a reduction of \$735,000 from the estimate and \$919,750 from the amount appropriated for 1953.

*Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene.*—The bill includes \$3,000,000, a reduction of \$985,000 from the request and \$700,000 from the 1953 appropriation. The committee feels strongly that both the Industrial Hygiene and Environmental Health Center activities in Cincinnati should be moved into the new building and that serious consideration should be given to consolidating the two activities organizationally.

*Grants, water-pollution control.*—The bill includes no funds for this item. This is a reduction of \$900,000 from the request. This item was also disallowed by the second session of the 82d Congress.

*Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska.*—The bill includes \$1,082,000, a reduction of \$25,000 from the original request and the same as the revised request of the Department.

#### HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

*Grants to States.*—The bill includes \$50,000,000, a reduction of \$25,000,000 from the request and from the appropriation for 1953. Over half a billion dollars of Federal funds have been appropriated for this purpose for the last six years. As of February 28, 1953, over \$172,000,000 already appropriated had not been expended. With considerable construction yet to be completed, it was testified that hospital administrators are having great difficulty in staffing hospitals

already completed. It was also found that many of the hospitals that have been built and staffed are used to only a small percent of their capacity. In explaining the very low occupancy rates the Chief of the Division practically admitted that hospitals were being built faster than the demand for them, when he said:

I would like to make a statement in that regard: The percentage of occupancy of a hospital is dependent on many factors. One of the most important is the factor of whether or not the community had a hospital before. People have to learn to use the hospitals. Physicians have to learn to use a hospital. Physicians who have practiced without a hospital for many years will not use the hospital the way a physician who has graduated in comparatively recent years will use a hospital (p. 772 of hearings).

An investigation of this program made at the direction of the committee revealed many other shortcomings of the program as it has operated during the last few years. Federal funds have been misused in building facilities at excessively high cost and in building facilities that add no hospital beds. Federal funds have not been spent where the greatest need for additional hospital facilities exists. A few of the facilities built with Federal funds are not being used now that they are completed.

Even after considering these facts, the committee has provided \$50,000,000 in the bill primarily because of the "split technique" of financing, which the committee has been informed is technically legal but is certainly one of the most ingenious ways of pressuring Congress for continued appropriations that the committee has yet encountered. Under this arrangement, a State is permitted to allot sufficient funds to a sponsor to start a hospital, with the understanding that Federal funds will be allotted in succeeding years to complete construction if sufficient appropriations are made, thus placing Congress in the position of having to continue appropriating funds every year indefinitely or be accused of stopping construction of partially built hospitals.

Inasmuch as this act does not expire until the end of fiscal year 1955 it is respectfully suggested and urged that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce not recommend an extension of the legislation until sufficient time has been allowed to permit that committee to have a complete and detailed survey made of the present operation of the program with a view to determining what amendments are necessary to correct the many faults which exist in the program as it is currently operated.

*Grants to States (liquidation of contract authorization).*—The bill includes \$19,700,000, the latest estimate of the Department of the amount required for 1954. This amount is \$104,000 below the estimate and \$40,000,000 less than the amount appropriated for the same purpose for 1953.

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$750,000, a reduction of \$450,000 below the request and the appropriation for 1953. These funds are used in large part for technical assistance to States. Since the States have their own technicians and the local sponsors have their own architects, the committee doubts the need for this amount of additional technical help.

*Hospitals and medical care.*—The bill includes \$32,500,000, a reduction of \$2,724,000 from the request and \$1,188,000 from the appropriation

tion for 1953. The committee will expect this division of the Public Health Service to get out of the commercial farming business, except where considerable therapeutic value to patients can be shown. Among other commercial farming operations, the Division is raising 1,250 beef cattle. It is suggested to the principal witness for the Division that he reevaluate his opinion that there is "Quite a good deal" of therapeutic value to patients in beef cattle raising.

*Foreign quarantine service.*—The bill includes \$2,900,000, a reduction of \$200,000 from the request and \$165,000 from the appropriation for 1953.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The bill includes \$61,586,200 in total for the National Institutes of Health. This is a reduction of \$23,413,800 from the original request, but \$2,555,450 over the appropriations for 1953 and \$5,246,200 over the revised budget presented to the committee by the Secretary on April 14, 1953.

The committee in general agrees with the Bureau of the Budget and the Department in their contention, in revising the budget, that greater emphasis should be placed on research activities and less on the related activities, especially grants to states for detection, diagnosis and other similar control activities.

The funds requested in the original budget for research grants and direct medical research totalled \$46,451,000, or only 55 percent of the total request of \$85,000,000. This compares with \$35,727,172 estimated to be spent on the two research activities in 1953 which is 61 percent of the total appropriations of \$59,030,750. The committee will expect the percentage spent on research to be greater instead of less in 1954. The action of the committee will provide increases for research in each of the Institutes, and a very substantial increase for the relatively new Institute for Neurological Diseases and Blindness.

The table at the end of this report shows comparisons, for each appropriation item, between the amount included in the bill, the 1953 appropriation, and the budget request. These comparisons are technically correct but due to transfers of activities between appropriations, they are somewhat misleading. The following table presents similar statistics for each activity on a more comparable basis:

Activity	Estimated 1953 obligations	Original 1954 request	Revised 1954 request	Amount included in bill
Operating expenses.....	\$5,010,350	\$5,180,000	\$4,675,000	\$4,675,000
Cancer.....	17,519,200	22,000,000	15,780,000	17,887,000
Mental health.....	10,819,000	15,500,000	9,817,000	10,895,000
Heart.....	11,775,000	16,590,000	11,040,000	12,000,000
Dental.....	1,650,000	2,700,000	1,740,000	1,650,000
Arthritis and metabolic diseases.....	4,568,900	8,450,000	4,976,000	5,000,000
Microbiology.....	5,479,200	7,000,000	5,738,000	5,479,200
Neurology and blindness.....	1,972,300	7,670,000	2,574,000	4,000,000
Total.....	58,793,950	85,000,000	56,340,000	61,586,200

The committee is completely at a loss to understand the action of the Bureau of the Budget in prohibiting for several weeks the hiring of personnel to staff the new Clinical Center. The Congress has always given its whole hearted support to this project. Over \$60,000,000 has been appropriated for the construction of this facility and funds were



appropriated last year to open the Center in April of 1953. The desires of Congress could not have been misunderstood. In view of other action taken by the Budget Director on matters related to this bill, the committee finds it difficult to understand this action to delay the opening of the Center in direct contravention of the desires of Congress and of all principles of good administration. Sufficient funds are included in the bill to open this Center as rapidly as is consistent with efficient conduct of all phases of this activity.

*Construction of research facilities.*—The bill includes \$2,500,000, the exact amount of the Department's latest estimate of the funds needed for this purpose. This amount is \$500,000 less than the original request and \$730,000 less than the 1953 appropriations.

*Retired pay of commissioned officers.*—The bill includes \$1,197,000, a reduction of \$18,000 from the request and \$11,000 more than the appropriation for 1953. The bill also includes language to make it possible for the Public Health Service to recall a retired officer to active duty with his consent. Under the current law, no retire' officer can be called to active duty, except in time of war, regardless of the urgency of the need for his services and his desire to return. In its desire to include only non-controversial legislative provisions in the bill the committee has not given the Service the authority to recall retired officers without their consent as can be done by the Military, however, it is respectfully suggested that the desirability of such an extension of recall authority be given consideration by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

*Salaries and expenses, Public Health Service.*—The bill includes \$2,900,000, a reduction of \$238,000 from the request and \$270,250 from the appropriation for 1953. The committee believes that reductions can be made in both "International health activities", and "Management and central services" without impairment of the service.

*Service and supply fund.*—The bill contains transfer authority to permit the additional capitalization of this revolving fund to the extent of \$200,000. The committee did not allow the additional appropriation requested, and is recommending the additional capitalization by transfer with some reluctance after learning of some of the operations carried on with these funds. The law establishing this fund states:

For the establishment of a service and supply fund, \$250,000, without fiscal year limitation, for the payment of salaries, travel, and other expenses necessary to the maintenance and operation of (1) a supply service for the purchase, storage, handling, issuance, packing, or shipping of stationery, supplies, materials, equipment, and blank forms, for which stocks may be maintained to meet, in whole or in part, requirements of the Public Health Service and requisitions of other Government offices, and (2) such other services as the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, determines may be performed more advantageously as central services. \* \* \*

After several years of operation, it was decided last year to establish a testing laboratory. From the list of items the committee was told they expect to test, this is to be a combination of a miniature Food and Drug Administration and a Bureau of Standards laboratory. The committee found that this had not been authorized by either the Surgeon General or the Administrator, as would seem to be required by the law. The committee was told nothing about the plans for this laboratory and would probably never have heard about it had



it not been for a visit to the supply center by a member of the committee staff. If the Department cannot justify the expenditure of funds for the operation of this laboratory much better than was done during this year's hearings, the committee will expect that it be discontinued and the equipment put to better use.

This is one of several instances of most questionable expenditure of Federal funds by the Public Health Service, none of which involves a large amount compared to the total appropriations, but in total represent a considerable sum of money. They indicate that Congress has been a little too generous in making appropriations and has tempted certain officials with funds which are in excess of essential needs.

#### ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$2,417,000, a reduction of \$11,500 from the request and \$103,000 from the 1953 appropriation.

*Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds.*—The bill includes \$399,500, a reduction of \$52,000 from the request and \$263,000 above the appropriation for 1953.

*Construction, maximum security building.*—The bill contains none of the \$195,000 requested for plans and specifications for construction of a new maximum security building. While there is some justification for such a building, the committee is not disposed to recommend any further appropriations for buildings so long as Federal patients are a minor part of the patient load and Federal funds bear 100% of the cost of construction.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.*—The bill includes authorization for the use of \$62,750,000 from the OASI trust fund, a reduction of \$1,250,000 from the request and an increase of \$250,000 over the amount authorized for 1953. This action should not be construed as disapproval of the job reclassification program presented in the justifications. It is an almost unique experience to have such a program presented in advance, and the fact that it has been, convinces the committee of the good intentions of the bureau to classify their employees properly. The committee will expect a report on this program next year and hopes that it will find its faith well founded.

*Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.*—The bill includes authorization to spend \$1,500,000 from the OASI trust fund for plans and specifications, and for beginning construction of a new building to house the central operations of the Bureau. At the present time, these operations are located in rented space in seven separate buildings. The physical separation of the operations results in inefficiencies and, in addition, much space now occupied is unsuitable for these activities. The committee is convinced that this building is necessary for the most economical operation of the program.

*Grants to States for public assistance.*—The bill includes \$1,340,000, 000, the same as the amount requested and the same as the amount appropriated for 1953. The full amount has been allowed only because it would be necessary to change the authorizing legislation to reduce the amount of Federal funds to be spent for this purpose. The com-

mittee is of the opinion that the ever-increasing cost to the Federal Government of public assistance during a period as prosperous as the last ten years is a matter that should be given most careful consideration, with a view to revising the legislation. Not only does the Federal Government now spend more than three times as much for public assistance than it did in 1945, but the share which the Federal Government bears has increased from 45.5 percent to an estimated 57.7 percent. The following statistics show this trend in more detail:

Fiscal year	State expenditures	Federal expenditures
	<i>Thousands</i>	<i>Thousands</i>
1945.....	\$499,541	\$417,570
1946.....	572,665	446,048
1947.....	648,350	615,923
1948.....	757,041	722,527
1949.....	872,155	939,520
1950.....	1,020,601	1,095,788
1951.....	1,065,974	1,188,179
1952.....	1,111,196	1,296,394
1953 (estimated).....	1,011,476	1,345,146
1954 (estimated).....	988,490	1,350,000

*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance.*—The bill includes \$1,600,000, a reduction of \$50,000 from the estimate and the same amount as appropriated for 1953.

*Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau.*—The bill includes \$1,500,000, a reduction of \$85,000 from the request and \$50,000 from the appropriation for 1953.

*Grants to States for maternal and child welfare.*—The bill includes \$30,000,000, a reduction of \$2,600,000 from the request and an increase of \$1,400,000 over the amount appropriated for 1953, however, the amount allowed will undoubtedly result in some reduction below the amount of actual expenditures for 1953, due to the difference in carryovers of funds from previous years. The exact amount of the reduction cannot be determined, but it will be relatively small.

*Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner.*—The bill includes \$296,500 (of which \$123,500 is to be transferred from the OASI trust fund), a reduction of \$28,500 from the request and an increase of \$2,500 above the appropriation for 1953.

*Operating fund, Federal Credit Unions.*—The bill includes \$250,000 as a loan which will be paid back to the Treasury with interest over a 10-year period starting July 1, 1955. Legislation was passed last year to raise the fees collected for services sufficiently to cover all costs of operation. While the Bureau will collect sufficient fees each year, under the collection schedule provided by the act, a substantial part will not be available until after January 31. Thus this loan is necessary to cover obligations incurred before fees are collected in sufficient amounts to cover them.

#### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

*Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary.*—The bill includes \$1,243,000 (of which \$168,000 is to be transferred from the OASI trust fund), a reduction of \$57,000 from the request and practically the

same as the \$1,093,000 appropriated for 1953, plus the comparative transfer of \$145,589 from other appropriations. The committee is convinced that the new Secretary will not require an increase in funds to do a much better job than did her predecessor.

*Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services.*—The bill includes \$2,210,000 (of which \$375,000 is to be transferred from the OASI trust fund), a reduction of \$133,000 from the request and the same as the amount appropriated for 1953.

*Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel.*—The bill includes \$725,000 (of which \$375,000 is to be transferred from other accounts), a reduction of \$160,000 from the request and \$75,000 from the appropriation for 1953.

*Surplus property disposal.*—The bill includes \$450,000, an increase of \$195,000 above the estimate and \$285,000 above the appropriation for 1953. For the past two years, the committee has been told of the great amount of compliance work that needs to be done with regard to the diversion of surplus property from the uses for which it was intended. The committee has been told of the considerable amount of funds that are legally due the Federal government, but are not collected because of the lack of personnel to conduct the necessary investigations. This contention has been very adequately confirmed by the cash collections made with the small force that is now available for this purpose. Why a larger appropriation was not requested is hard to perceive. The official in charge of this activity estimated that five times the amount expended for this work would be returned to the Treasury in collections. The committee has therefore increased this item above the budget request—the only item on which such action was taken. The committee will expect that all of the increase above the 1953 appropriation will be spent on compliance work and wants it understood that this is a temporary increase to be deleted from the appropriation as soon as the backlog of compliance work is reduced to normal proportions.

#### APPROPRIATION RESCISSIONS

*National Heart Institute (contract authority).*—The bill contains a reduction of \$3,124 in the 1950 appropriation of contract authority for construction which has now been completed. The amount recommended for rescission is the balance which was not needed for this purpose.

*Construction of research facilities, Public Health Service (contract authority).*—The bill contains a reduction of \$800,000 in the contract authorization in the 1950 appropriation for construction in connection with the new Clinical Center. The committee was advised that this amount is not needed for that purpose.

*Grants to States, municipalities, etc., for plan preparation, water pollution control.*—The bill contains a reduction of \$200,000. This appropriation was made several years ago, and none of the amount has been obligated. The committee was advised that there are no plans to use these funds.

*Research facilities, National Institute of Dental Research.*—The bill contains a reduction of \$23,573.49 which remains from the 1950 appropriation for this purpose. The construction has been completed and the balance was not needed for this purpose.



*Payments to States for surveys and programs for hospital construction.*—The bill includes a provision to rescind the balance of funds appropriated for this purpose. These survey funds have been available since 1947, but for various reasons all of them have not been needed or utilized. Since the legislation under which these funds were granted expires at the end of fiscal year 1955 and since there are no definite plans to utilize these funds, the committee is recommending their rescission.

*Grants for surveys and school construction.*—The bill contains a provision to rescind the balance of the funds provided in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, for school construction surveys. The legislation authorizing this survey expires at the end of this fiscal year and practically all of the funds for construction are already allocated to specific projects. The committee therefore is recommending the rescission of funds for survey work.

### NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$9,000,000, a reduction of \$800,000 from the estimate and the same amount as appropriated for 1953. It is recognized that the Board has a backlog of cases, but it is also recognized that a certain amount of backlog must be normally expected in any activity of this type. The committee was not convinced that sufficient increase in workload should be expected in 1954 to justify an increase in funds.

### NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The bill includes \$1,064,000 for the activities of the Board. This is a reduction of \$104,000 from the request and \$66,000 from the appropriation for 1953.

### RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes authorization for the expenditure of \$6,207,000 from the railroad retirement trust fund, a reduction of \$193,000 from the estimate and the same as the amount authorized for 1953. The committee has not granted authority for the replacement of the Board's automobile; in fact, the need for any automobile is seriously doubted.

*Payment to railroad retirement account.*—The bill contains a reduction of \$18,656,682 in the appropriations for fiscal years 1951 and prior fiscal years. During these years, an annual appropriation was made based on estimated tax receipts under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act. The reduction recommended is the amount by which the appropriations exceeded the tax collections plus a small amount (less than one percent) of interest on the over-appropriation. The amount of the rescission has been recommended by the Budget Director under the last Administration and by the Budget Director under the present Administration, and seems to the committee to be eminently fair. The Chairman of the Board certainly violated the spirit and, it would seem, also the letter of the law in openly opposing the President's budget. This matter has been called to the attention of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

## FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$3,200,000, a reduction of \$500,000 from the request and \$200,000 from the appropriation for 1953.

*Boards of inquiry.*—The bill includes \$10,000, a reduction of \$37,500 from the original request and from the appropriation for 1953, but the same amount as recommended by the Service at the time of the hearings.

## LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 13 in connection with "Freedmen's Hospital," Department of Health, Education and Welfare—

*Provided further, That legal residents of areas outside the District of Columbia shall be given care and treatment only if arrangements are made in advance for such persons, or the government agency having responsibility for such persons, to reimburse Freedmen's Hospital in full for the cost of such care and treatment:*

On page 20 in connection with "National Institutes of Health, operating expenses", Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—

*Provided, That the Surgeon General is authorized to advance to this appropriation from other appropriations to the Public Health Service such amounts as are determined to be necessary for the foregoing purposes and for activities performed on a centralized basis: Provided further, That the Surgeon General is authorized to operate facilities at the National Institutes of Health for the sale of meals to employees and others and the proceeds thereof may be credited to this appropriation.*

On page 22 in connection with "Retired pay of commissioned officers", Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—

*: Provided, That hereafter a commissioned officer of the Public Health Service who has been retired may be recalled to active duty, other than in time of war, with his consent.*

On page 23 in connection with "Service and supply fund", Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—

*to be derived by transfer from such other funds appropriated in this Act to the National Institutes of Health as the Surgeon General may determine, to remain available until expended: Provided, That any stocks of supplies and equipment of the Public Health Service related to services financed under this fund may also be used to capitalize said fund.*

On page 27 in connection with "Operating fund, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions", Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—

*to be available for the purposes of such fund without fiscal year limitation: Provided, That this amount shall be treated as a loan to such fund and shall bear interest, payable annually, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury after taking into consideration the average rate of interest payable upon all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States: Provided further, That beginning not later than July 1, 1955, such amount shall be paid from such fund into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts at an annual rate of not less than one-tenth of such amount.*

On page 31 in connection with "General Provisions—Department of Health, Education, and Welfare"—

*SEC. 206. The Secretary is authorized to make such transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices, without transfer of funds, as may be required in carrying out the operations of the Department.*

## PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS, GENERAL AND SPECIAL FUNDS

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1953	Estimates, 1954	Increase (+), decrease (-)
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
American Printing House for the Blind (act of June 25, 1906)-----	\$10, 000	\$10, 000	-----
Office of Education:			
Payments to States and Territories for colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts (act of Mar. 4, 1907)-----	2, 550, 000	2, 550, 000	-----
Payments to States for promotion of vocational education (act of Feb. 23, 1917)-----	7, 150, 123	7, 138, 331	-\$11, 792
Total, Office of Education-----	9, 700, 123	9, 688, 331	-11, 792
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare-----	9, 710, 123	9, 698, 331	-11, 792
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD			
Payment to railroad retirement account-----	683, 000, 000	694, 852, 000	+11, 852, 000
Railroad Unemployment Insurance Administration fund-----	11, 000, 000	11, 000, 000	-----
Total, Railroad Retirement Board-----	694, 000, 000	705, 852, 000	+11, 852, 000
Total permanent appropriations, all agencies-----	703, 710, 123	715, 550, 331	+11, 840, 208

## TRUST FUNDS

[Not a charge against general revenue]

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1953	Estimates, 1954	Increase (+), decrease (-)
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
Bureau of Employees' Compensation:			
Relief and rehabilitation, Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended-----	\$36, 000	\$36, 000	-----
Relief and rehabilitation, Workmen's Compensation Act, within the District of Columbia-----	9, 000	9, 000	-----
Bureau of Labor Statistics: Special statistical work-----	28, 700	-----	-\$28, 700
Total, Department of Labor-----	73, 700	45, 000	-28, 700
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
Public Health Service:			
Patients benefit fund, Public Health Service hospitals-----	1, 000	1, 000	-----
Public Health Service conditional gift fund-----	25	-----	-25
Public Health Service unconditional gift fund-----	52, 520	51, 730	-790
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare-----	53, 545	52, 730	-815
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD			
Railroad retirement account-----	773, 324, 469	793, 752, 000	+20, 427, 531
Total trust funds, all agencies-----	773, 451, 714	793, 849, 730	+20, 398, 016



**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1953, ESTIMATES FOR 1954, AND AMOUNTS  
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1954**

**TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

[Figures in brackets not added in totals]

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1953	Estimates, 1954	Recommended in bill for 1954	Bill compared with—	
				1953 appropriations	1954 estimates
<b>OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY</b>					
Salaries and expenses-----	\$1, 663, 000	\$1, 585, 000	\$1, 250, 000	—\$413, 000	—\$335, 000
<b>OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR</b>					
Salaries and expenses-----	1, 764, 600	1, 764, 600	1, 350, 000	—414, 600	—414, 600
<b>BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS</b>					
Salaries and expenses-----	838, 000	998, 000	624, 000	—214, 000	—374, 000
<b>BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS</b>					
Salaries and expenses-----	285, 700	346, 000	300, 000	+14, 300	—46, 000
<b>BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP</b>					
Salaries and expenses-----	3, 369, 000	3, 400, 000	2, 700, 000	—669, 000	—700, 000
<b>BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY</b>					
Salaries and expenses-----	5, 679, 000	5, 867, 000	5, 100, 000	—579, 000	—767, 000



Grants to States-----	197, 110, 000	218, 000, 000	187, 300, 000	-9, 810, 000	-30, 700, 000
Unemployment compensation for veterans--	27, 200, 000	47, 000, 000	41, 000, 000	+13, 800, 000	-6, 000, 000
Mexican farm labor program-----	2, 705, 000	1, 740, 000	1, 250, 000	-1, 455, 000	-490, 000
Total, Bureau of Employment Security-----	232, 694, 000	272, 607, 000	234, 650, 000	+1, 956, 000	-37, 957, 000
BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION					
Salaries and expenses-----	2, 221, 100	2, 180, 000	2, 000, 000	-221, 100	-180, 000
Employees' compensation fund-----	[35, 000, 000]	[35, 000, 000]	[35, 000, 000]	-----	-----
Total, Bureau of Employees' Compensation-----	2, 221, 100	2, 180, 000	2, 000, 000	-221, 100	-180, 000
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS					
Salaries and expenses-----	5, 779, 000	5, 939, 000	5, 250, 000	-529, 000	-689, 000
WOMEN'S BUREAU					
Salaries and expenses-----	360, 000	360, 000	300, 000	-60, 000	-60, 000
WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION					
Salaries and expenses-----	7, 639, 139	7, 639, 000	6, 000, 000	-1, 639, 139	-1, 639, 000
Total, Department of Labor-----	256, 613, 539	296, 818, 600	254, 424, 000	-2, 189, 539	-42, 394, 600

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1953, estimates for 1954, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1954—Con.*

**TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE**

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1953	Estimates, 1954	Recommended in bill for 1954	Bill compared with—	
				1953 appropriations	1954 estimates
AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND					
Grant funds (education of the blind)-----	\$175, 000	\$175, 000	\$175, 000		
COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF					
Salaries and expenses-----	413, 000	417, 000	410, 000	—\$3, 000	—\$7, 000
Construction of buildings-----	90, 000			—90, 000	
Total, Columbia Institution for the Deaf-----	503, 000	417, 000	410, 000	—93, 000	—7, 000
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses (general)-----	5, 600, 000	5, 663, 000	5, 000, 000	—600, 000	—663, 000
Certification and inspection services, salaries and expenses-----	[1, 050, 000]	[1, 050, 000]	[1, 050, 000]		
Total, Food and Drug Administration-----	5, 600, 000	5, 663, 000	5, 000, 000	—600, 000	—663, 000
FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL					
Salaries and expenses-----	2, 860, 750	3, 196, 000	2, 750, 000	—110, 750	—446, 000
Facilities planning-----		50, 000			—50, 000
Total, Freedmen's Hospital-----	2, 860, 750	3, 246, 000	2, 750, 000	—110, 750	—496, 000

HOWARD UNIVERSITY					
Salaries and expenses.....	2, 675, 000	2, 750, 000	2, 240, 000	- 435, 000	- 510, 000
Plans and specifications.....	30, 000	55, 000	-----	- 30, 000	- 55, 000
Construction of buildings.....	280, 221	170, 000	20, 000	- 260, 221	- 150, 000
Construction of buildings (liquidation of contract authorization).....	1, 061, 779	1, 900, 000	-----	- 1, 061, 779	- 1, 900, 000
Total, Howard University.....	4, 047, 000	4, 875, 000	2, 260, 000	- 1, 787, 000	- 2, 615, 000
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Promotion and further development of vocational education.....	18, 673, 261	18, 673, 261	16, 048, 870	- 2, 624, 391	- 2, 624, 391
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts.....	2, 480, 000	2, 501, 500	-----	- 2, 480, 000	- 2, 501, 500
Salaries and expenses.....	2, 960, 000	3, 250, 000	2, 500, 000	- 460, 000	- 750, 000
Payments to school districts (maintenance and operations).....	60, 500, 000	70, 000, 000	60, 500, 000	-----	- 9, 500, 000
School construction (grants).....	195, 000, 000	-----	-----	- 195, 000, 000	-----
Total, Office of Education.....	279, 613, 261	94, 424, 761	79, 048, 870	- 200, 564, 391	- 15, 375, 891
OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION					
Payments to States.....	22, 250, 000	23, 000, 000	20, 600, 000	- 1, 650, 000	- 2, 400, 000
Salaries and expenses.....	700, 000	725, 000	500, 000	- 200, 000	- 225, 000
Total, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.....	22, 950, 000	23, 725, 000	21, 100, 000	- 1, 850, 000	- 2, 625, 000

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1953, estimates for 1954, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1954—Con.*

**TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued**

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1953	Estimates, 1954	Recommended in bill for 1954	Bill compared with—	
				1953 appropriations	1954 estimates
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE					
Venereal diseases-----	\$9, 800, 000	\$8, 325, 000	\$5, 000, 000	—\$4, 800, 000	—\$3, 325, 000
Tuberculosis-----	8, 240, 000	7, 645, 000	5, 725, 000	—2, 515, 000	—1, 920, 000
Assistance to States, general-----	16, 200, 000	16, 315, 000	13, 250, 000	—2, 950, 000	—3, 065, 000
Communicable diseases-----	5, 919, 750	5, 735, 000	5, 000, 000	—919, 750	—735, 000
Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene-----	3, 700, 000	3, 985, 000	3, 000, 000	—700, 000	—985, 000
Grants, water-pollution control-----	-----	900, 000	-----	-----	—900, 000
Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska-----	1, 107, 500	1, 107, 000	1, 082, 000	—25, 500	—25, 000
Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio-----	300, 000	-----	-----	—300, 000	-----
Hospital construction:					
Grants to States-----	75, 000, 000	75, 000, 000	50, 000, 000	—25, 000, 000	—25, 000, 000
Grants to States (liquidation of contract authorization)-----	59, 700, 000	19, 804, 000	19, 700, 000	—40, 000, 000	—104, 000
Salaries and expenses-----	1, 200, 000	1, 200, 000	750, 000	—450, 000	—450, 000

Hospitals and medical care-----	33, 688, 000	35, 224, 000	32, 500, 000	-1, 188, 000	-2, 724, 000
Foreign quarantine service-----	3, 065, 000	3, 100, 000	2, 900, 000	-165, 000	-200, 000
National Institutes of Health:					
Operating expenses-----	16, 598, 750	5, 180, 000	4, 675, 000	-11, 923, 750	-505, 000
National Cancer Institute-----	17, 887, 000	22, 000, 000	17, 887, 000	-----	-4, 113, 000
Mental health activities-----	10, 895, 000	15, 500, 000	10, 895, 000	-----	-4, 605, 000
National Heart Institute-----	12, 000, 000	16, 500, 000	12, 000, 000	-----	-4, 500, 000
Dental health activities-----	1, 650, 000	2, 700, 000	1, 650, 000	-----	-1, 050, 000
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities-----	-----	8, 450, 000	5, 000, 000	+5, 000, 000	-3, 450, 000
Microbiology activities-----	-----	7, 000, 000	5, 479, 200	+5, 479, 200	-1, 520, 800
Neurology and blindness activities-----	-----	7, 670, 000	4, 000, 000	+4, 000, 000	-3, 670, 000
Total, National Institutes of Health-----	59, 030, 750	85, 000, 000	61, 586, 200	+2, 555, 450	-23, 413, 800
Construction of research facilities (liquidation of contract authorization)-----	3, 230, 000	3, 000, 000	2, 500, 000	-730, 000	-500, 000
Retired pay of commissioned officers-----	1, 186, 000	1, 215, 000	1, 197, 000	+11, 000	-18, 000
Salaries and expenses, Public Health Service-----	3, 170, 250	3, 138, 000	2, 900, 000	-270, 250	-238, 000
Service and supply fund-----	-----	200, 000	-----	-----	-200, 000
Total, Public Health Service-----	284, 537, 250	270, 893, 000	207, 090, 200	-77, 447, 050	-63, 802, 800



*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1953, estimates for 1954, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1954—Con.*

**TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued**

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1953	Estimates, 1954	Recommended in bill for 1954	Bill compared with—	
				1953 appropriations	1954 estimates
ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL					
Salaries and expenses	\$2, 520, 000	\$2, 428, 500	\$2, 417, 000	—\$103, 000	—\$11, 500
Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds	136, 500	451, 500	399, 500	+263, 000	—52, 000
Construction, maximum security building		195, 000			—195, 000
Construction and equipment of treatment building	6, 125, 000			—6, 125, 000	
Total, St. Elizabeths Hospital	8, 781, 500	3, 075, 000	2, 816, 500	—5, 965, 000	—258, 500
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance:					
Salaries and expenses (trust fund limitation)	[62, 500, 000]	[64, 000, 000]	[62, 750, 000]	[+250, 000]	[—1, 250, 000]
Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance (trust fund limitation)		[1, 500, 000]	[1, 500, 000]	[+1, 500, 000]	
Bureau of Public Assistance:					
Grants to States for public assistance	1, 340, 000, 000	1, 340, 000, 000	1, 340, 000, 000		

Salaries and expenses-----	1, 600, 000	1, 650, 000	1, 600, 000	-----	-50, 000
Children's Bureau:					
Salaries and expenses-----	1, 550, 000	1, 585, 000	1, 500, 000	-50, 000	-85, 000
Grants to States for maternal and child welfare-----	28, 600, 000	32, 600, 000	30, 000, 000	+1, 400, 000	-2, 600, 000
Office of Commissioner, salaries and expenses:					
Appropriation-----	185, 000	190, 000	173, 000	-12, 000	-17, 000
Transfer from OASI fund-----	[109, 000]	[135, 000]	[123, 500]	[+14, 500]	[-11, 500]
Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, salaries and expenses:					
General fund appropriation-----	200, 000			-200, 000	-----
Operating fund-----		250, 000	250, 000	+250, 000	-----
Total, Social Security Administration-----	1, 372, 135, 000	1, 376, 275, 000	1, 373, 523, 000	+1, 388, 000	-2, 752, 000
OFFICE OF SECRETARY					
Salaries and expenses, Office of Secretary:					
Appropriation-----	950, 000	1, 120, 000	1, 075, 000	+125, 000	-45, 000
Transfer from OASI-----	[143, 000]	[180, 000]	[168, 000]	[+25, 000]	[-12, 000]
Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services:					
Appropriation-----	1, 835, 000	1, 930, 000	1, 835, 000	-----	-95, 000
Transfer from OASI-----	[375, 000]	[413, 000]	[375, 000]	-----	[-38, 000]

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1953, estimates for 1954, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1954—Con.*

**TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued**

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1953	Estimates, 1954	Recommended in bill for 1954	Bill compared with—	
				1953 appropriations	1954 estimates
OFFICE OF SECRETARY—continued					
Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel:					
Appropriation-----	\$387, 500	\$455, 000	\$350, 000	—\$37, 500	—\$105, 000
Transfers (OASI and Food and Drug)-----	[412, 500]	[430, 000]	[375, 000]	[—37, 500]	[—55, 000]
Surplus property disposal-----	165, 000	255, 000	450, 000	+285, 000	+195, 000
Working capital fund (for central services)-----	50, 000	-----	-----	—50, 000	-----
Total, Office of Secretary-----	3, 387, 500	3, 760, 000	3, 710, 000	+322, 500	—50, 000
Total, Department of Health, Education and Welfare-----	1, 984, 590, 261	1, 786, 528, 761	1, 697, 883, 570	—286, 706, 691	—88, 645, 191

**TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD**

Salaries and expenses-----	\$9, 000, 000	\$9, 800, 000	\$9, 000, 000	-----	—\$800, 000
----------------------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	-------	-------------



TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses-----	\$429, 000	\$441, 000	\$429, 000	-----	-\$12, 000
Arbitration and emergency boards-----	148, 000	138, 000	138, 000	-\$10, 000	-----
National Railroad Adjustment Board, salaries and expenses-----	553, 000	589, 000	497, 000	-\$6, 000	-\$92, 000
Total, National Mediation Board-----	1, 130, 000	1, 168, 000	1, 064, 000	-\$66, 000	-\$104, 000

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses (transfer from railroad retirement trust fund)-----	[\$6, 207, 000]	[\$6, 400, 000]	[\$6, 207, 000]	[-----]	[-\$193, 000]
---	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	---------	---------------

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses-----	\$3, 400, 000	\$3, 700, 000	\$3, 200, 000	-\$200, 000	-\$500, 000
Boards of inquiry-----	47, 500	47, 500	10, 000	-\$37, 500	-\$37, 500
Total, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service-----	3, 447, 500	3, 747, 500	3, 210, 000	-\$237, 500	-\$537, 500
Grand total, all titles of bill-----	2, 254, 781, 300	2, 098, 062, 861	1, 965, 581, 570	--289, 199, 730	--132, 481, 291



Union Calendar No. 138

83<sup>D</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 5246

[Report No. 426]

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 15, 1953

Mr. BUSBEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

## A BILL

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4       in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-  
5       ments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. and

1 related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June  
2 30, 1954, namely:

3 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

4 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
6 Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title re-  
7 ferred to as the Secretary), including services as authorized  
8 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.  
9 55a) ; teletype news service; any payment in advance when  
10 authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library  
11 membership in organizations whose publications are avail-  
12 able to members only or to members at a price lower than to  
13 the general public; \$1,250,000.

14 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

15 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
16 Office of the Solicitor, \$1,350,000: *Provided*, That the com-  
17 pensation of the Solicitor shall be \$14,800 per annum.

18 BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

19 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
20 promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and  
21 amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; per-  
22 formance of safety functions of the Secretary under the  
23 Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5  
24 U. S. C. 784 (c) ) ; performance of the functions vested in  
25 the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations



1 Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g) ) ; and not to ex-  
2 ceed \$70,000 for the work of the President's Committee on  
3 National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as au-  
4 thorized by the Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), in-  
5 cluding purchase of reports and of material for informational  
6 exhibits; \$624,000.

7 BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

8 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to render  
9 assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment  
10 rights under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service  
11 Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App 308), the Serv-  
12 ice Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army Reserve  
13 and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as amended,  
14 and section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Serv-  
15 ice Act, and, under the Act of June 23, 1943, as amended  
16 (50 U. S. C. App. 1472), of persons who have performed  
17 service in the Merchant Marine, \$300,000.

18 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

19 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to en-  
20 able the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging  
21 apprentice training, as authorized by the Act of August 16,  
22 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50), \$2,700,000.

23 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

24 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
25 general administration of the employment service and un-

1 employment compensation programs, including temporary  
2 employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service  
3 laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program;  
4 and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by sec-  
5 tion 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ;  
6 \$5,100,000, of which \$981,000 shall be for carrying into  
7 effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the  
8 Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

9 Grants to States for unemployment compensation and  
10 employment service administration: For grants in accord-  
11 ance with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as  
12 amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect  
13 section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944,  
14 for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the  
15 Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503);  
16 including, upon the request of any State, the purchase of  
17 equipment and the payment of rental for space made avail-  
18 able to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose,  
19 for necessary expenses in connection with the operation of  
20 employment office facilities and services in the District of  
21 Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for,  
22 necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjust-  
23 ment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684), \$187,300,-  
24 000, of which \$10,000,000 shall be available only to  
25 the extent that the Secretary finds necessary to meet in-

1 creased costs of administration resulting from changes in  
2 a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed  
3 and claims paid over those upon which the State's  
4 basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Co-  
5 lumbia) was based, which increased costs of administra-  
6 tion cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjust-  
7 ments: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision to  
8 the contrary in section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act,  
9 as amended, the Secretary of Labor shall from time to time  
10 certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to  
11 each State found to be in compliance with the requirements  
12 of the Act of June 6, 1933, and, except in the case of  
13 Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, with the provisions of  
14 section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such  
15 amounts as he determines to be necessary for the proper and  
16 efficient administration of its unemployment compensation  
17 law and of its public employment offices: *Provided further*,  
18 That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Depart-  
19 ment of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be used  
20 for the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly  
21 determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail  
22 matter in connection with the administration of unemploy-  
23 ment compensation systems and employment services by  
24 States receiving grants herefrom.

25 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,

1 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social  
2 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and  
3 maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall  
4 apply.

5 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the  
6 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State  
7 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation  
8 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of offi-  
9 cers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from  
10 the said agencies of any States which have established by  
11 legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system  
12 and classification and compensation plan covering the selec-  
13 tion, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees,  
14 because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner  
15 of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the  
16 rates of pay of said officers or employees.

17 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-  
18 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to  
19 States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended,  
20 and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first  
21 quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may  
22 be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures  
23 made thereunder for payments under such title and under  
24 such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the appropriation  
25 therefor for that fiscal year.



1       Unemployment compensation for veterans: For pay-  
2       ments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV  
3       of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952,  
4       \$41,000,000.

5       Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program: For  
6       expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out  
7       the functions of the Department of Labor under the Act of  
8       July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78), including temporary em-  
9       ployment of persons without regard to the civil service laws,  
10      \$1,250,000.

11               BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

12      Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative  
13      expenses and not to exceed \$87,000 for the Employees'  
14      Compensation Appeals Board, \$2,000,000, together with  
15      not to exceed \$90,000 to be derived from the War Claims  
16      Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of  
17      1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

18      Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of  
19      compensation and other benefits and expenses (except ad-  
20      ministrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing dur-  
21      ing the current or any prior fiscal year, including payments  
22      to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital services  
23      pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of Em-  
24      ployees' Compensation; continuation of payment of bene-

1 fits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits"  
2 in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947;  
3 the advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in  
4 third-party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital  
5 services and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial ex-  
6 penses, including transportation and other expenses in-  
7 cidental to such services, treatment, and burial, for such  
8 enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified  
9 by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital services  
10 and treatment at Government expense on June 30, 1943,  
11 and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian em-  
12 ployees of the United States, and the limitations and  
13 authority of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended  
14 (5 U. S. C. 796), shall apply in providing such services,  
15 treatment, and expenses in such cases; such amount as  
16 may be required during the current fiscal year: *Provided*,  
17 That this appropriation shall be available for payments pur-  
18 suant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of the War Claims Act  
19 of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012) and shall be credited with  
20 advances or reimbursements therefor from the War Claims  
21 Fund created by section 13 (a) of said War Claims Act of  
22 1948.

23 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

24 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
25 work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement

1 to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for  
2 services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for services  
3 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
4 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$5,250,000.

5 WOMEN'S BUREAU

6 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
7 work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of  
8 June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of  
9 reports and material for informational exhibits, \$300,000.

10 WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

11 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for per-  
12 forming the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act  
13 of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions for  
14 the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the  
15 United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41  
16 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State,  
17 Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspec-  
18 tion services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for expenses  
19 of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at con-  
20 ferences concerned with the work of the Division, \$6,000,000.

21 GENERAL PROVISIONS

22 SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for  
23 salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic  
24 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of



1 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), for examination of esti-  
2 mates of appropriations in the field, and for expenses of  
3 attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activ-  
4 ity for which any such appropriation is made.

5 This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor  
6 Appropriation Act, 1954".

7 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
8 EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

9 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

10 Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of  
11 August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), \$175,000.

12 COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

13 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of  
14 Columbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal serv-  
15 ices and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improve-  
16 ments, \$410,000: *Provided*, That the Columbia Institution  
17 for the Deaf, shall be paid by the District of Columbia, in  
18 advance at the beginning of each quarter, at the rate of  
19 \$1,150 per school year for each student attending said In-  
20 stitution pursuant to the Act of March 1, 1901 (31 D. C.  
21 Code 1008).

22 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

23 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for car-  
24 rying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as

1 amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392) ; the Tea Importation Act,  
2 as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50) ; the Import Milk Act  
3 (21 U. S. C. 141-149) ; the Federal Caustic Poison Act  
4 (15 U. S. C. 401-411) ; and the Filled Milk Act, as  
5 amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64) ; reporting and illustrating  
6 the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, appa-  
7 ratus, and scientific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for  
8 payment in advance for special test and analyses by contract;  
9 and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection with  
10 studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug  
11 enforcement operations; \$5,000,000.

12 Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection serv-  
13 ices: For expenses necessary for the certification or in-  
14 spection of certain products in accordance with sections  
15 406, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food,  
16 Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346,  
17 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of  
18 the advance deposits during the current fiscal year to cover  
19 payment of fees by applicants for certification or inspection  
20 of such products, to remain available until expended. The  
21 total amount herein appropriated shall be available for  
22 personal services; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and  
23 scientific equipment; and the refund of advance deposits  
24 for which no service has been rendered.

## FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard University" for salaries of technical and professional personnel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such university; \$2,750,000: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary from any other appropriation in this title: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of



1 each quarter: *Provided further*, That legal residents of areas  
 2 outside the District of Columbia shall be given care and  
 3 treatment only if arrangements are made in advance for  
 4 such persons, or the government agency having responsibility  
 5 for such persons, to reimburse Freedmen's Hospital in full  
 6 for the cost of such care and treatment: *Provided further*,  
 7 That the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities  
 8 imposed upon him by the foregoing proviso.

#### 9 HOWARD UNIVERSITY

10 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of How-  
 11 ard University, including personal services and miscellaneous  
 12 expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds, \$2,240,000.

13 Construction of buildings: For the purchase and installa-  
 14 tion of a vacuum pump in the steam system, \$20,000.

#### 15 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

16 Promotion and further development of vocational edu-  
 17 cation: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the  
 18 Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15), section  
 19 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), section  
 20 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30), and the  
 21 Act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462), \$16,048,870:  
 22 *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States under the  
 23 Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed on the  
 24 basis of not to exceed \$15,873,870 for the current fiscal year:

1 *Provided further*, That none of this appropriation shall be  
2 available for vocational education in distributive occupations.

3       Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
4 Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investiga-  
5 tions, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination  
6 of public and school library service; coordination of library  
7 service on the national level with other forms of adult educa-  
8 tion; developing library participation in Federal projects;  
9 fostering Nation-wide coordination of research materials  
10 among libraries, interstate library coordination and the de-  
11 velopment of library service throughout the country; pur-  
12 chase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents,  
13 motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, ex-  
14 change, and cataloging of educational apparatus and ap-  
15 pliances, articles of school furniture and models of school  
16 buildings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and  
17 methods of education, and repairing the same; \$2,500,000:  
18 *Provided*, That all receipts from non-Federal agencies repre-  
19 senting reimbursement for expenses of travel of employees  
20 of the Office of Education performing advisory functions to  
21 the said agencies shall be deposited in the Treasury of the  
22 United States to the credit of this appropriation.

23       Payments to school districts: For payments to local  
24 educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of  
25 schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950

1 (Public Law 874), \$60,500,000: *Provided*, That this appro-  
2 priation shall also be available for carrying out the provisions  
3 of section 6 of such Act.

4 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

5 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and  
6 Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska,  
7 Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Voca-  
8 tional Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4),  
9 including payments, in accordance with regulations of the  
10 Secretary, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the  
11 acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accord-  
12 ance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for the use of  
13 blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be con-  
14 trolled by the State agency, \$20,600,000, of which not to  
15 exceed \$175,000 shall be available to the Secretary for provid-  
16 ing rehabilitation services to disabled residents of the District  
17 of Columbia, as authorized by section 6 of said Act, which  
18 latter amount shall be available for administrative expenses  
19 in connection with providing such services in the District  
20 of Columbia: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15 per centum  
21 of the appropriation shall be used for administrative purposes.

22 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and  
23 Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making,  
24 after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States



1 in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as  
2 amended (including the objects specified in the preceding  
3 paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding  
4 fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations  
5 incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be  
6 charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year:  
7 *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this para-  
8 graph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the  
9 first quarter of the current fiscal year.

10 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in car-  
11 rying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,  
12 as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20  
13 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including not to exceed \$3,000 for pro-  
14 duction, purchase, and distribution of educational films;  
15 \$500,000.

16 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

17 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public Health  
18 Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) (hereinafter  
19 referred to as the Act), and other Acts, including expenses  
20 for active commissioned officers in the Reserve Corps and  
21 for not to exceed one thousand five hundred commissioned  
22 officers in the Regular Corps; as follows:

23 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sec-  
24 tions 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal  
25 diseases including the operation and maintenance of centers

1 for the diagnosis and treatment of persons afflicted with  
2 venereal diseases; and for grants of money, services, sup-  
3 plies, equipment, and use of facilities to States, as defined  
4 in the Act, and with the approval of the respective State  
5 health authorities, to counties, health districts, and other  
6 political subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes,  
7 in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the  
8 Surgeon General may determine; \$5,000,000.

9       Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314  
10 (b) of the Act, \$5,725,000.

11       Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes,  
12 not otherwise specifically provided for, of section 314 (c) of  
13 the Act; to provide consultative services to States pursuant  
14 to section 311 of the Act; to make field investigations and  
15 demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the Act; and to  
16 provide for collecting and compiling mortality, morbidity,  
17 and vital statistics; \$13,250,000.

18       Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as other-  
19 wise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311,  
20 and 361 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppres-  
21 sion of communicable and preventable diseases, and the inter-  
22 state transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase,  
23 erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; and hire,  
24 maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$5,000,000.

1       Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For  
2   expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out  
3   those provisions of sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of  
4   the Act relating to sanitation and other aspects of environ-  
5   mental health, including enforcement of applicable quaran-  
6   tine laws and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carry-  
7   ing out the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act  
8   (33 U. S. C. 466-466 (j) ) ; \$3,000,000.

9       Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Ter-  
10   ritory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct,  
11   in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Terri-  
12   tory of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the  
13   investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases,  
14   and the establishment and maintenance of health and sani-  
15   tation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in  
16   sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of  
17   subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set  
18   forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361 and 363 of the  
19   Act, including the hire, operation, and maintenance of air-  
20   craft, and the purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable  
21   buildings, \$1,082,000.

22       Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hos-  
23   pital construction under part C, title VI, of the Act, as  
24   amended, to remain available until expended, \$50,000,000:  
25   *Provided*, That allotments under such part C to the several



1 States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis  
2 of an amount equal to the appropriation granted herein.

3 Grants for hospital construction (liquidation of contract  
4 authorization) : For payment of obligations incurred under  
5 authority heretofore granted under this head, \$19,700,000.

6 Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:  
7 For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI  
8 of the Act, as amended, \$750,000.

9 Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the func-  
10 tions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August 8,  
11 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), and under sections 321, 322, 324,  
12 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the  
13 Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079  
14 of February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of  
15 farm products and livestock; and purchase of firearms and  
16 ammunition; \$32,500,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall be  
17 exclusively available for payments to the Territory of Hawaii  
18 for care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy:  
19 *Provided*, That when the Public Health Service establishes  
20 or operates a health service program for any department or  
21 agency, payment for the estimated cost shall be made in  
22 advance for deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

23 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-  
24 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to preventing  
25 the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign coun-

tries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance with section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of the Public Health Service are not available, including insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; \$2,900,000.

National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not otherwise provided for, including research fellowships and grants for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act; not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection of temporary structures; and grants of therapeutic and chemical substances for demonstrations and research; \$4,675,000: *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to advance to this appropriation from other appropriations to the Public Health Service such amounts as are determined to be necessary for the foregoing purposes and for activities performed on a centralized basis: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to operate facilities at the National Institutes of Health for the sale of meals to employees and others and the proceeds thereof may be credited to this appropriation.

National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon Gen-

1 eral, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory  
2 Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and train-  
3 ing projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State  
4 health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit in-  
5 stitutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of can-  
6 cer by providing consultative services, demonstrations, and  
7 grants-in-aid; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of  
8 title IV, part A, of the Act; \$17,887,000.

9 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for  
10 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311,  
11 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases,  
12 \$10,895,000.

13 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to  
14 carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act,  
15 \$12,000,000.

16 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise  
17 provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to  
18 carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental  
19 diseases and conditions, \$1,650,000.

20 Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: For expenses  
21 necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to  
22 arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, \$5,000,000.

23 Microbiology activities: For expenses necessary to carry  
24 out the purposes of the Act relating to microbiology, includ-



1 ing the regulation and preparation of biologic products,  
2 \$5,479,200.

3       Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses neces-  
4 sary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to neurology  
5 and blindness, \$4,000,000.

6       Construction of research facilities (liquidation of contract  
7 authorization): For payment of obligations incurred pur-  
8 suant to authority granted to enter into contracts for con-  
9 struction of a combined hospital and research building as  
10 authorized in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation  
11 Acts of 1949 and 1950, to be transferred to the General  
12 Services Administration, \$2,500,000.

13       Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay  
14 of commissioned officers, as authorized by law, \$1,197,000, to  
15 remain available until expended: *Provided*, That hereafter  
16 a commissioned officer of the Public Health Service who has  
17 been retired may be recalled to active duty, other than in  
18 time of war, with his consent.

19       Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of  
20 the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous  
21 expenses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for  
22 elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and pub-  
23 lications related to public health; conducting studies and  
24 demonstrations in public health methods; and carrying on  
25 international health activities, including not to exceed \$1,000



1 for entertainment of officials of other countries when specifi-  
2 cally authorized by the Surgeon General; \$2,900,000.

3       Service and supply fund: For additional working capital  
4 for the "Service and supply fund," created by title II of the  
5 Act of July 3, 1945 (42 U. S. C. 231), not to exceed  
6 \$200,000, to be derived by transfer from such other funds  
7 appropriated in this Act to the National Institutes of Health  
8 as the Surgeon General may determine, to remain available  
9 until expended: *Provided*, That any stocks of supplies and  
10 equipment of the Public Health Service related to services  
11 financed under this fund may also be used to capitalize said  
12 fund.

13       Administrative provisions: During the current fiscal  
14 year, and with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,  
15 there may be transferred from any annual appropriation to  
16 the Public Health Service to any other such appropriation  
17 such additional amounts as may be required for pay and  
18 allowances of the active commissioned officers herein au-  
19 thorized, but any amounts so transferred shall not exceed  
20 5 per centum of any such appropriation and no such appro-  
21 priation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum as a  
22 result of any such transfers.

23                   SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

24       Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
25 maintenance and operation of the hospital, including pur-

1 chase of clothing for patients and cooperation with organ-  
2 izations or individuals in scientific research into the nature,  
3 causes, prevention and treatment of mental illness,  
4 \$2,417,000.

5 Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds:  
6 For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and  
7 equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including prep-  
8 aration of plans and specifications, advertising, and super-  
9 vision of construction, \$399,500: *Provided*, That any part  
10 of this amount may be transferred to the General Services  
11 Administration.

12 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

13 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors  
14 Insurance: For necessary expenses, including furnishing,  
15 repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equipment  
16 used by building guards; not more than \$62,750,000 may  
17 be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insur-  
18 ance trust fund.

19 Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insur-  
20 ance: For beginning construction of an office building and  
21 appurtenant facilities for the Bureau of Old-Age and Sur-  
22 vivors Insurance, including equipment, acquisition of land  
23 (including donations thereof), and preparation of plans and  
24 specifications, \$1,500,000, to be derived from the Federal  
25 old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and to remain

1 available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations for  
2 the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to the General  
3 Services Administration, but the selection of the site and the  
4 building plans shall be subject to approval by the Secretary:  
5 *Provided further*, That the total cost of the project herein  
6 authorized shall not exceed \$27,000,000, but this limita-  
7 tion may be exceeded, or shall be reduced, by an amount  
8 equal to the percentage increase or decrease, if any, in con-  
9 struction costs generally dating from January 1, 1953, as  
10 determined by the Administrator of General Services.

11 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to  
12 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid  
13 to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled,  
14 as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social  
15 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV,  
16 X, and XIV), \$1,340,000,000, of which such amount as  
17 may be necessary shall be available for grants for any period  
18 in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year.

19 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance:  
20 For expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance,  
21 \$1,600,000.

22 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary  
23 expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as  
24 amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6), and title V of the Social  
25 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),



1 including purchase of reports and material for the publica-  
2 tions of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution,  
3 \$1,500,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation  
4 contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry  
5 out any instructions, order, or regulation relating to the care  
6 of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons  
7 licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided*  
8 *further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed  
9 as to prevent any patient from having the services of any  
10 practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so  
11 long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*,  
12 That any State plan which provides standards for profes-  
13 sional obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the  
14 State shall be approved.

15 Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For  
16 grants to States for maternal and child-health services, serv-  
17 ices for crippled children, and child-welfare services as  
18 authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security  
19 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),  
20 \$30,000,000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pur-  
21 suant to section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not  
22 be included in computing for the purposes of subsections (a)  
23 and (b) of sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount  
24 expended or estimated to be expended by the State.

25 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For



1 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner for  
2 Social Security, \$173,000, together with not to exceed  
3 \$123,500 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and  
4 survivors insurance trust fund.

5 Operating fund, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions: For  
6 additional working capital for the fund established by section  
7 5 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U. S. C. 1755),  
8 \$250,000, to be available for the purposes of such fund  
9 without fiscal year limitation: *Provided*, That this amount  
10 shall be treated as a loan to such fund and shall bear interest,  
11 payable annually, at a rate determined by the Secretary of  
12 the Treasury after taking into consideration the average rate  
13 of interest payable upon all marketable interest-bearing obli-  
14 gations of the United States: *Provided further*, That begin-  
15 ning not later than July 1, 1955, such amount shall be paid  
16 from such fund into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts  
17 at an annual rate of not less than one-tenth of such amount.

18 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-  
19 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to  
20 States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respectively, of  
21 the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter  
22 of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be neces-  
23 sary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made  
24 thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be  
25 charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

1 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, re-  
2 spectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, payments  
3 to a State under any of such titles for any quarter in the period  
4 beginnning April 1 of the prior year, and ending June 30  
5 of the current year, may be made with respect to a State  
6 plan approved under such title prior to or during such period,  
7 but no such payment shall be made with respect to any  
8 plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which such plan  
9 was submitted for approval.

10 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

11 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For ex-  
12 penses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, \$1,075,000,  
13 together with not to exceed \$168,000 to be transferred from  
14 the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

15       Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services: For  
16   expenses necessary for the Office of Field Services, \$1,835,-  
17   000, together with not to exceed \$375,000 to be transferred  
18   from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel:  
For expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel,  
\$350,000, together with not to exceed \$20,000 to be  
transferred from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses,  
certification and inspection services", and not to exceed

1 \$355,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and  
2 survivors insurance trust fund.

3 Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for  
4 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k)  
5 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act  
6 of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal  
7 excess property for educational purposes and protection of  
8 public health, \$450,000.

9 REDUCTIONS IN CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

10 The contract authorization granted under the head  
11 "National Heart Institute", in the Federal Security Agency  
12 Appropriation Act, 1950, is hereby reduced by the amount  
13 of \$3,124.

14 The contract authorization granted under the head "Con-  
15 struction of research facilities, Public Health Service" in  
16 title II of the Federal Security Appropriation Act of 1950  
17 is hereby reduced by the sum of \$800,000.

18 REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

19 Amounts available from appropriations are hereby re-  
20 duced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be  
21 carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury  
22 immediately upon the approval of this Act, except as other-  
23 wise indicated:



1       “Grants to States, municipalities, etc., for plan prepara-  
2   tion, water pollution control”, \$200,000;

3       “Research facilities, National Institute of Dental  
4   Research” Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1950,  
5   \$23,573.49;

6       “Payments to States for surveys and programs for hos-  
7   pital construction”: The balance remaining unexpended on  
8   the date of approval of this Act;

9       “Grants for surveys and school construction”: The bal-  
10   ance of the amount appropriated under section 101 of Public  
11   Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, second session (which sum  
12   was included under this head in chapter V of the Supple-  
13   mental Appropriation Act of 1951), which is unexpended  
14   on the date of approval of this Act.

15                                   GENERAL PROVISIONS

16       SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for  
17   salaries and expenses shall be available for examination of  
18   estimates of appropriations in the field, and for payment in  
19   advance for dues or fees for library membership in organiza-  
20   tions whose publications are available to members only or  
21   to members at a price lower than to the general public.

22       SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for  
23   salaries and expenses shall be available for services as au-  
24   thorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
25   U. S. C. 55a).

1       SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for  
2 salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses  
3 and not to exceed \$25,000 of such funds shall be available  
4 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the  
5 functions or activities for which such appropriations are  
6 made.

7       SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated by this title  
8 to the Social Security Administration for grants in aid of  
9 State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of  
10 operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses  
11 of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld  
12 from the said agencies of any States which have established  
13 by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit  
14 system and classification and compensation plan covering  
15 the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their  
16 employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel  
17 or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said  
18 States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

19       SEC. 206. The Secretary is authorized to make such  
20 transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices,  
21 without transfer of funds, as may be required in carrying  
22 out the operations of the Department.

23       This title may be cited as the "Department of Health,  
24 Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1954".

## 1 TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS

## 2 BOARD

3 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
4 National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions  
5 vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947  
6 (29 U. S. C. 141–167), and other laws, including expenses  
7 of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the  
8 Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the  
9 General Counsel; and services as authorized by section 15  
10 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$9,000,-  
11 000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be  
12 available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural  
13 laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings,  
14 directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of  
15 agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the  
16 Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as amended by the  
17 Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as defined in  
18 sections 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1060).

19 This title may be cited as the “National Labor Relations  
20 Board Appropriation Act, 1954”.

## 21 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

22 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
23 National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting



1 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
2 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$429,000.

3 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses neces-  
4 sary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of the  
5 Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157), and  
6 emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant to  
7 section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including steno-  
8 graphic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the  
9 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$138,000.

#### 10 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

11 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
12 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic  
13 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
14 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$497,000, of which not  
15 less than \$200,000 shall be available for compensation (at  
16 rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of referees  
17 appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act,  
18 as amended.

19 This title may be cited as the "National Mediation  
20 Board Appropriation Act, 1954".

#### 21 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

22 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust  
23 fund): For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement

1 Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of  
2 attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board  
3 when specifically authorized by the Board; and stenographic  
4 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act  
5 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$6,207,000, to be  
6 derived from the railroad retirement account.

#### 7 REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

8 Payment to railroad retirement account: Appropria-  
9 tions granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 and  
10 prior fiscal years are hereby reduced by the sum of  
11 \$18,656,682, which shall be carried to the surplus of the  
12 Treasury.

13 This title may be cited as the "Railroad Retirement  
14 Board Appropriation Act, 1954".

#### 15 TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND 16 CONCILIATION SERVICE

17 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
18 Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-  
19 Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171-180,  
20 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel  
21 as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employ-  
22 ment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor  
23 relations at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses  
24 of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and indus-

1 trial relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of  
2 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$3,200,000.

3 Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay  
4 necessary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the  
5 President pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management  
6 Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176–180, 182) , including  
7 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,  
8 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) , and rent in the District of Columbia,  
9 \$10,000.

10 This title may be cited as the “Federal Mediation and  
11 Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1954”.

## 12 TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

13 SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained  
14 in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of  
15 any person who engages in a strike against the Government  
16 of the United States or who is a member of an organization  
17 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike  
18 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-  
19 cates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the  
20 overthrow of the Government of the United States by force  
21 or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affi-  
22 davit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the per-  
23 son making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions  
24 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government



1 of the United States, is not a member of an organization of  
2 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against  
3 the Government of the United States, or that such person  
4 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization  
5 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the  
6 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That  
7 any person who engages in a strike against the Government  
8 of the United States or who is a member of an organization  
9 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike  
10 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-  
11 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,  
12 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by  
13 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or  
14 wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained  
15 in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction,  
16 shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not  
17 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the  
18 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in  
19 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

20 SEC. 702. No part of any appropriation contained in this  
21 Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not  
22 authorized by the Congress.

23 SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this  
24 Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee  
25 engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that

1 would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one  
2 hundred and five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and  
3 intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided,*  
4 That for purposes of this section employees shall be consid-  
5 ered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time  
6 or more in personnel administration consisting of direction  
7 and administration of the personnel program; employment,  
8 placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification;  
9 employee relations and services; training; committees of  
10 expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage  
11 administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

12 This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Labor and  
13 Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1954."

83<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

**H. R. 5246**

[Report No. 426]

---

# A BILL

---

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. BUSBY

---

MAY 15, 1953

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed



# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued May 20, 1953

For actions of May 19, 1953

83rd-1st, No. 91

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

## CONTENTS

Annual leave.....20	Farm price ceiling.....9	Prices, farm.....19
Appropriations....1,7,8,24	Foreign aid.....3	Price supports.....13
Automobiles.....8	Foreign economic policy..14	Publications.....8
Budgeting.....12	Labor; farm.....8	Retirement.....20
Committee assignment.....5	Lands, public.....2	St. Lawrence Seaway.....18
Cost of living.....21	Information.....10	Soil depreciation.....22
Economic controls.....9	Legislative program.....15	Subsidies.....23
Education.....7,8	Livestock.....13	Textiles.....17
Electrification.....6,16	Personnel.....8,11,20,21	Trade, foreign.....4,17

**HIGHLIGHTS:** House debated agricultural appropriation bill. General debate was concluded, and bill is to be read for amendment today. Senate passed economic controls bill. Senate passed measure for Foreign Economic Policy Commission. Senate committees reported bills excluding major officials from leave law and creating Joint Budget Committee.

## HOUSE

1. **AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954.** Began debate on this bill, H. R. 5227 (pp. 5317-49). General debate was concluded, and the bill is to be read for amendment today.
2. **PUBLIC LANDS.** Passed as reported H. R. 2512, to amend the Small Tract Act of 1938 (authorizing lease or sale of 5 acres or less of public lands for certain purposes) so as to extend its application and facilitate its administration (p. 5297).  
Passed as reported H. R. 1815, to extend the scope of the Recreation Act, which authorizes Interior to sell or lease public lands to States and subdivisions for recreational uses (pp. 5298-9).
3. **FOREIGN AID.** Passed without amendment H. R. 2312, to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress, providing a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold (p. 5297).
4. **FOREIGN TRADE.** Rep. Rogers, Mass., spoke in favor of protection of domestic industry through adequate tariffs (pp. 5353-4).
5. **COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT.** Rep. Tuck, Va., was elected to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 5294).
6. **ELECTRIFICATION.** Rep. Pfost claimed most Republicans are against "low-cost public power" (pp. 5305-6).
7. **EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS.** Rep. Brown, Ga., spoke against cuts in vocational-education items in the Labor-HEW appropriation bill (pp. 5351-3).
8. **LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954.** In reporting this bill, H. R. 5246 (see



Biggest (C), the Appropriations Committee included the following statements in its report:

Mexican Farm Labor Program. "The committee has serious misgivings about this program, which guarantees to foreign agricultural workers coming into this country many things such as medical care for sickness or injury incurred on the job, minimum wages, adequate living quarters, etc., which are not guaranteed to our own citizens. It provides a labor recruitment program for farmers in one part of our country, while farmers on our East Coast pay for their own recruitment of laborers from outside the Continental United States. However, in view of the recent approval of an extension of the basic legislation by a large majority of the House of Representatives, the committee is recommending a continuation of appropriations. The bill includes \$1,150,000 for the first six months' operation of the program, plus \$100,000 for program liquidation if the agreement with Mexico, which expires December 31, 1953, is not extended. This is a reduction of \$490,000 from the request."

Education. "Promotion and further development of vocational education.-- The bill includes \$16,048,870, a reduction of \$2,624,391 from the request and from the appropriation for 1953... The committee is in agreement with the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary in their belief that this program has matured to the point where its 'promotion and further development' should gradually be turned over to the States."

"Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts.-- The bill includes no amounts for this item. This is a reduction of \$2,501,500 from the estimate and \$2,480,000 from the 1953 appropriation."

Up-Grading. "The committee is very much concerned with the general tendency in both the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare continually to up-grade jobs and to apply reductions in personnel primarily in the lower grades... If this trend continues, the committee will give serious consideration to placing a limitation in the bill next year to force correction."

Automobiles. "The committee has disallowed all requests for authority to purchase automobiles, either as additions to the fleet or as replacements."

Publications. "The committee strongly urges the new Secretary (of HEW) to maintain a closer control over the publications of the Department than has been maintained in the past."

## SENATE

9. ECONOMIC CONTROLS. Passed with amendments S. 1081, providing for temporary economic controls, after substituting therefor a modified committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended. Adopted, 45-41, a Byrd amendment restricting the President's authority to impose standby wage-price controls unless Congress has declared war or has found that a grave national emergency exists; and a Young amendment establishing a formula for ceiling prices on farm products at not less than the parity. Rejected, 26-61, a Bricker amendment to eliminate the provisions for standby price-wage controls. (pp. 5260-85.)
10. INFORMATION. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment S. 971, to authorize films and related material for educational use to be transmitted through the mails at the rate provided for books (S. Rept. 293) (p. 5259).
11. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendment H.R. 4654, to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch (S. Rept. 294) (p. 5259).







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued May 22, 1953

For actions of May 21, 1953

83rd-1st, No. 93

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

## CONTENTS

Adjournment.....2	Farm situation.....18	Personnel.....4,12
Appropriations.....10	Fig festival.....15	Prices, farm.....30
Budgeting.....3	Flood control.....6,13	support.....22
Citizenship.....7	Foreign agriculture re-	Reclamation.....16
Conservation.....19	porting.....28	Reorganization.....1
Education.....25,31	Forestry.....5,24	Research.....23
Electrification....14,17,21	Information.....8	St. Lawrence seaway.....20
Extension Service...2,11,31	Loans, farm.....14	Trade, foreign.....29
Farm program.....19,27	Natural resources.....26	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee voted in favor of USDA reorganization plan. Senate passed Joint Budget Committee bill, and bill to consolidate Extension Service authorizations. House committee reported Extension Service consolidation bill. House debated Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Rep. D'Ewart defended stockmen's grazing bill.

## SENATE

1. REORGANIZATION. The Government Operations Committee voted, 9 to 3, to report adversely S. Res. 100, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 relative to this Department. Prior to this action the Committee, by a vote of 3 to 4, defeated a motion to report the resolution without recommendation. Before these votes, the Reorganization Subcommittee voted, 5 to 1, against the resolution. The foregoing committee action signifies committee approval of the reorganization plan. (pp. D451-2.)
2. EXTENSION SERVICE. Passed without amendment S. 1679, to consolidate authorizations for extension work. There was some discussion of the possibility of amending the bill to specifically mention 4-H clubs, but it was decided that this was unnecessary in view of definite statements on the floor that the bill included authorization for such work and that there was no intention of discontinuing the project. (pp. 5479-80.)
3. BUDGETING. Passed as reported S. 833, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies (pp. 5484-6). The bill provides as follows: Establishes a Joint Committee on the Budget composed of 14 members chosen from the Appropriations Committees. The Committee would review and investigate budgetary requirements of the executive branch and would have a separate staff to enable it to carry out this function. Staff members would work closely with the two Appropriations Committees and would attend executive sessions of the appropriations subcommittees. Authorizes the joint committee to report on and recommend appropriate legislative changes to standing legislative committees. Directs the Comptroller General, at the request of the joint committee chairman, to make investigations and reports on budgetary matters. Requires that all committees, in reporting bills authorizing appropriations, must include in their reports estimates of the initial and continuing cost of such authorizations



over a 5-year period, and requires the Appropriations Committees to maintain compilations of all such estimates and to annually print these compilations. Authorizes the joint committee to recommend joint hearings by the Appropriations Committees on the appropriation bills.

S. Con. Res. 8, providing for a consolidated general appropriation bill, was passed over at the request of Sen. Hayden, who inserted a letter from Rep. Phillips opposing the measure (pp. 5478-9).

4. PERSONNEL. Passed without amendment S. 1870, to extend from Dec. 31, 1953, until June 30, 1954, the period within which the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel must submit its report (pp. 5482-3).
5. FOREST LAND. Passed without amendment S. 731, to authorize transfer of a tract of Forest Service land at Cherry Point, N. C., to the Navy Department (p. 5469).
6. FLOOD CONTROL. Passed as reported S. 261, approving the Connecticut River Flood Control Compact (pp. 5469-71).
7. CITIZENSHIP CONFERENCE. Passed without amendment S. 677, to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship (pp. 5472-3).
8. INFORMATION. Passed without amendment S. 971, to authorize films and related material for educational use to be transmitted through the mails at the rate provided for books (p. 5484).
9. RECESSED until Mon., May 25 (p. 5489).

#### HOUSE

10. APPROPRIATIONS. <sup>Began</sup> ~~Concluded general~~ debate on H. R. 5246, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1954. Reps. Fogarty, Polk, Wickersham, Miller of Kans., and others spoke against committee cuts for vocational education in agriculture and home economics. (pp. 5509-34.)
11. EXTENSION SERVICE. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 4677, to consolidate Extension Service authorizations (H. Rept. 448) (p. 5536).
12. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 5275, to extend the time of the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel to file its report from Dec. 31, 1953, until June 30, 1954 (p. D454).
13. FLOOD CONTROL. Rep. Passman described flood damage in Ia. and urged "sufficient appropriations" for flood control on the Lower Miss. River and its tributaries (p. 5509).
14. REA LOANS. Rep. Harvey said Henry County, Ind., recently completed payment of their loan (p. 5509).
15. FIG FESTIVAL. Rep. Hunter discussed the Calif. fig industry and the annual May "fig festival time" (p. 5509).
16. RECLAMATION. Received Interior's letter transmitting Calif. recommendations on the Trinity River division, Central Valley project (p. 5536).  
Received a Hawaii Legislature memorial favoring irrigated pastoral areas on Hawaiian Homes Commission lands (p. 5537).



Why not look at its whole propaganda output?

Analyze it. Classify it.

Then you will realize it is part of a subtle plan to color our thinking with a false picture of Poland, and make us indifferent to the sufferings of her people. All part of the strategy to separate us from our allies and friends, isolate us from the world, and make us ripe for the final harvest.

The American people, and particularly those of Polish extraction, are disturbed by the apathy of our Government in failing to curb these enemy activities within our country.

Everyone knows that Red Russia instigated the Korean war.

Everyone should know that Red Russia, again and indirectly, through its satellite embassies, is waging another war by propaganda within the United States. If the State Department cannot exercise any control over these dangerous activities it is up to the Congress to be realistic and expose this method of Communist infiltration.

#### FLOOD DAMAGE IN THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

(Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Louisiana due to its geographical location handles all the drainage of 42 percent of the area of the United States. The rainfall from 31 States in this great Nation seeks egress through streams flowing through Louisiana.

At this time in Louisiana there are 7,000 families which are homeless due to floodwaters. One of our great cities of 35,000 population is almost cut off from other parts of the State of Louisiana on account of this floodwater. One river overflowed its levees and is now spread over a width of some 20 miles and may reach a length of 80 miles. Five already are known to have lost their lives in this catastrophe.

Some members of the Louisiana delegation are being called back to their State on account of this flood.

Mr. Speaker, I am mentioning this so that when the flood-control bill reaches the floor next week you will understand, as many of us do, the necessity of making sufficient appropriations for the Lower Mississippi and its tributaries flood-control project, to continue this great work which will ultimately afford us the protection to which we are justly entitled.

#### CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday afternoon I made remarks in the House, part of which were incorrectly reported. I ask unanimous consent that the official Record be corrected to show that where I am reported to have said—page 5460, column 3, lines 45-47: "There seems to be a slogan going around today, 'Cut, cut, cut, the budget,'" that I actually said, "There seems to be a slogan going around today in official defense

circles, "Talk tough, and cut the budget."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

#### CZECHOSLOVAKIA SANCTIONS

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, all Americans were very glad to note the release of William Oatis from prison in Czechoslovakia due, as we note in the press, mainly to the appeal made by Mrs. Oatis. Subsequent to that I noticed in the newspapers that a spokesman for the State Department indicated that certain sanctions we had made against Czechoslovakia while Oatis was in prison might be removed by our country. Now, I do not say on my present information that the State Department has that intention, but we know that when someone who is a spokesman in the State Department indicates that that might be done, that it is seriously under consideration. The official's name in the State Department was mentioned. My thought is that we should not of our own volition remove those sanctions that we have imposed; at least, there ought to be a request from the present individuals who are in control of the Government of Czechoslovakia, because, at least, there is a trading point and a talking point. I do not see any situation, by reason of the release of Oatis, which we are all pleased to note, why we should gratuitously lift the sanctions that have been imposed. I repeat, I do not say that the State Department has that in mind, and my observations are purely made for the purpose of having the Secretary of State and those associated with him give serious consideration to not gratuitously lifting those sanctions; at least, waiting for the request, and then enter into talks and considerations that might produce other results favorable to our country.

#### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION LOANS

(Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate on the bill we concluded yesterday, on appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, I noted considerable comment as to the soundness of the loans that have been granted to local cooperatives through the Rural Electrification Administration for the purpose of supplying electricity to farm homes where it was not otherwise available.

I call the attention of the House to the fact that my own county in Indiana,

Henry, completed payment of their obligation to the Federal Government just recently. The information that comes to me is that this is the first of the loans that were made for the purpose of providing rural electrification to the farmers to be paid in full and from revenue derived from the sale of electricity to the farmers.

#### FIG FESTIVAL TIME

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, from the sunny valley of the San Joaquin, fig capital of America, the word is being spread throughout the Nation that May is fig festival time. Colorful displays not only advertise the excellence of this delicious California fruit, but they also remind the public of the many ways figs are being served today by discriminating hostesses. This annual festival is sponsored by all California fig growers, under the auspices of the California Fig Institute, to celebrate the growing American popularity of a fruit that has been one of mankind's favorites since the beginning of recorded time.

California is the sole source of dried figs in the United States, and the California fig industry, with its orchards and processing facilities, constitutes a capital investment of more than \$40 million, and offers employment to thousands of persons each year. Its welfare is tightly interwoven into the economic fabric of the great and diversified agriculture of the sovereign State of California.

It is with these facts in mind that I invite the legislators of the Nation to join with me in celebrating fig festival time in the San Joaquin Valley, fig capital of the United States.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to arrange with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for division and control of the time for general debate. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island express his ideas as to the time he would like to have for general debate?

Mr. FOGARTY. As I said last evening to the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the committee, I think we should agree on 4 hours of general debate today, read the first paragraph of the bill, and then start tomorrow reading the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate



on the bill be limited to 4 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5246, with Mr. NICHOLSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, before explaining any of the provisions contained in the bill and the reasons for the action of the committee, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to pay my respects to each and every member of the committee on both sides.

I have had the honor and privilege of working with many committees in the House of Representatives before being assigned to the Appropriations Committee. I can truthfully and honestly and sincerely say that I have never enjoyed working with the members of any committee more than I have with the members of this committee. I particularly desire to pay tribute to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], who has served on the committee for 11 years, and as chairman for the past 4 years. He has been exceedingly helpful to me. I am not saying anything on the floor today that I have not said to Members individually and privately beyond the range of Mr. FOGARTY's ears. I think Mr. FOGARTY is indeed a credit to the membership of the House of Representatives. He is a gentleman at all times. He is very, very considerate of everyone's problems. I do not believe there is a single soul in the entire United States that has a greater personal interest in the various programs that come under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee on appropriations than has Mr. FOGARTY. His knowledge and experience have been invaluable to everyone on the committee, and particularly to me. He has been very generous with his knowledge and experience in assisting and counseling me during my first year as chairman. While we may differ in some instances as to how much money should be appropriated to administer individual programs, any differences between Mr. FOGARTY and me, I know, are honest disagreements. It has been a pleasure to work with him, and I hope to continue to draw on his knowledge and guidance in the future, as I have in the past.

I should also like to mention the fact that, while I know that the various subcommittees on appropriations have very fine assistants on their staffs, frankly, I do not know what I would have done this year without the most efficient and untiring assistance and cooperation of the executive secretary of the subcommittee, Mr. Robert M. Moyer. He has diligently studied this appropriation bill and every item therein. Any time anyone needed

information, he was able to supply it immediately. I very much appreciate his valuable assistance.

In round figures, this appropriation bill contains a total of \$1,965,000,000. That compares with \$2,250,000,000 for the fiscal year 1953, and the original budget request of \$2,100,000,000. It is \$289 million below the 1953 appropriation, and is \$132 million below the requested 1954 budget. It is \$56,500,000 below the revised budget request.

The bill includes \$1,340,000,000, two-thirds of the total amount, for grants to States for public assistance. Payments under this appropriation are required by law and are subject to no control through appropriations unless the law is changed. The committee made reductions only in instances where it honestly believed such reductions would be effective in saving Federal funds, and has therefore made no reduction in the request for this item.

Leaving out of consideration the uncontrollable item of grants for public assistance, the committee reduced the total amount requested by over 17 percent, and the amount included in the bill is 31 percent below the amount appropriated for 1953. However, the 1953 appropriations included \$195 million for school construction, which was not requested in the 1954 budget.

I wish to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that each item in this bill was carefully examined by the committee. The hearings which we held on items that are included in the bill occupy 2,500 pages in four volumes. After these hearings, we sat in executive session, to arrive at our recommendations, from 9:15 in the morning until about 6 in the evening, with a short period out for a sandwich. There are no across-the-board cuts in this bill, and there are no misleading cuts in the bill. It would be very easy to reduce the amount requested for an item, like grants for public assistance, by \$100 million or \$200 million, but that would not be a real cut, because we know that we would be required by law to replace this in a supplemental bill. I merely mention that because I want to reemphasize it and to assure the House that there are no phony cuts in this bill.

While the committee took no action with respect to grants for public assistance, except to approve the request, I am of the opinion that the ever-increasing cost to the Federal Government of public assistance during a period as prosperous as the last 10 years is a matter that should be given most careful consideration, with a view to revising the legislation. Not only does the Federal Government now spend more than three times as much for public assistance as it did in 1945, but the share which the Federal Government bears has increased from 45.5 percent to an estimated 57.7 percent.

The committee tried to cooperate with every Member of the House, many of whom had a particular interest in one or more items. Many had an interest in vocational education; some, in vocational rehabilitation; others, in hospital construction, or the numerous other items contained in the bill.

Over 40 Members appeared before the committee not only to present their views

regarding various items in which they were particularly interested, but to give the committee the advantage of their own experience and personal knowledge of the operation of the programs in their congressional districts.

There is one new item of expense in the Department of Labor that is unavoidable. The bill includes \$41 million for unemployment compensation of veterans which, like public-assistance grants, is not controllable administratively. These payments must be made to the eligible veterans in accordance with mathematical formulas prescribed in the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. While the amount included in the bill shows in the report table as a reduction from the request, this is due entirely to the fact that the Department revised its estimate of the cost of this item downward after the budget was prepared. The \$41 million included in the bill is the exact amount of the Department's latest estimate. This amount is \$13,800,000 above the amount appropriated for 1953, principally because the law did not go into effect until after the beginning of the 1953 fiscal year.

The total amount included in the bill for the Department of Labor is less than 1 percent below the 1953 appropriations. In other words, the committee made sufficient reductions in other items in the Department to counterbalance almost exactly the increase for unemployment compensation for veterans. While this is a rather substantial reduction of over \$42 million below the budget request, I firmly believe that there was not one cut made which will cripple any program.

The total amount in the bill for salaries and expenses for the Department is slightly above the 1950 appropriation. The amount for grants for unemployment compensation and employment services is also a salaries-and-expenses item, but goes to pay for State salaries and related costs. This appropriation, while a substantial cut below the request, is more than \$13 million above the appropriation for 1950.

For the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the bill includes \$1,700,000,000, of which \$1,340,000,000 is for grants to States for public assistance, and \$360 million for other activities.

Leaving out the public-assistance item, the committee has made a reduction of approximately 25 percent from the amount requested for 1954.

The budget included many requests for grants to States to carry out programs that the committee felt were primarily the responsibility of the States and communities, and that the responsibility should eventually be shifted to them. We realize that these responsibilities cannot be shifted all at once; we therefore decided as a committee to make a moderate cut this year, with the intention of making further progress in this direction during the next few years.

The committee was quite concerned about the tremendous amount of travel that was being done in these agencies and we came to the conclusion that it was excessive.



The committee has disallowed all requests for authority to purchase automobiles, either as additions to the fleet or as replacements. The committee is convinced that the Department, and especially the Public Health Service, has far more automobiles than are necessary. The Public Health Service automobiles are listed, starting on page 649 of the hearings, with pertinent information concerning each. In order that those officials who need automobiles in the conduct of their official duties may have them, the committee has included language in the bill authorizing the Secretary to transfer automobiles between appropriations.

The committee was also concerned about the continual upgrading of positions in several bureaus. Mr. Chairman, because I had always been suspicious of the way Dr. Earl McGrath, the former Commissioner of Education, was running his division, I had a special study made of the classification and upgrading in two divisions: School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas, and State and Local School Systems.

Classification under the Government system consists of comparing the duties and responsibilities of a position with a set of specifications, or standards, promulgated by the Civil Service Commission for each class, or series, of positions, and each grade within a class or series. The ultimate norm of grade within a class or series is contained in the Classification Act of 1949.

We thus have a constant and a variable—the specification or standard being the constant, and the position being the variable. Our chief source of information on the variable is the position-description sheet. Because it is not feasible to desk-audit each position, the strength or weakness of the system depends to a great extent on the veracity of a position description. Such descriptions are usually signed by the incumbent and by the supervisor.

A spot check by a qualified investigator of a number of position-description sheets disclosed that, in almost every instance, they compared favorably with the standard for the grade in which the job is presently classified.

Sadly enough, this proves very little. It is not difficult to make a position description fit a standard—a standard for any grade we want to make the job. Without casting any reflections on anyone, the Civil Service Commission did call attention to a number of erroneous descriptions in their audit of the agency.

A second limitation in the classification field is that it takes little cognizance of efficient organization. It can determine that a number of individuals are doing high-powered work. It cannot determine whether it is necessary for all these people to do high-powered work.

This falls into the field of efficient management. The medical profession might well illustrate our point. The renowned specialist on the left nostril could conceivably treat the right nostril too, but if we split the work, we have two kings, each top man on his special nostril, and, of course, two bills to pay.

The survey showed that the position descriptions in these two divisions appeared to be classified correctly. Some of the descriptions were evidently somewhat erroneous. It appeared that there are quite a number of highly graded jobs, although such a situation can well exist in an area where a number of specialists are employed. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a few comments from the investigator's report:

I have made a rather exhaustive study of promotions and other personnel actions, as reflected in the personnel cards and in many of the files. There are set out below a summary of personnel actions on all employees still listed on the rolls as of April 30, 1953, in these two divisions:

*Division of School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas*

A. SECTIONS LOCATED IN WASHINGTON	
Present employees upgraded since Jan. 1, 1951 .....	36
Present employees not upgraded since Jan. 1, 1951 .....	40
Present employees in second group hired since Jan. 1, 1952 .....	14
B. FIELD OPERATIONS SECTION	
Present employees upgraded since Jan. 1, 1951 .....	8
Present employees not upgraded since Jan. 1, 1951 .....	41
Present employees in second group hired since Jan. 1, 1952 .....	16

During this period there were 10 employees reclassified upward 2 or more grades. (GS-7 to GS-9 and GS-9 to GS-11 in the professional group is not considered 2 grades.)

Attention is invited to the figures in the field-operations area of the Division, wherein upgrading was not so prevalent. It should be noted that of the 49 jobs checked, 16 are already at GS-13, which appears to be the top grade for field representative, and 10 of the jobs are at GS-12. There are 4 jobs at GS-11, but I failed to locate any in this area at GS-7 or GS-9. It then appears that they didn't have very many jobs to upgrade without opening new field offices.

In regard to promotions of more than 1 grade, I found 3 individuals, who had been in GS-3, were moved up to GS-7 in periods of from 3 to 6 months. In addition, 2 of these employees had received periodic with ingrade salary increases 9 months after reaching GS-7. The usual waiting period is 1 year, as prescribed by law.

Another employee, who was in GS-11 at Veterans' Administration in April 1951, was appointed here GS-12, and 6 months later was a GS-13.

A statistician, elsewhere at GS-7, was appointed here at GS-9 in December 1950, and reached GS-11 in August 1951.

1951 began cool for a GS-7 in 1 agency but warmed quickly by January 15, when she received a GS-9 appointment. Lest winter catch her unprepared, she was upgraded to GS-11 in August of 1951. Before 1952 was gone she was promoted to GS-12, which promotion has now been made permanent.

A secretary occupying a GS-4 position at the beginning of 1951 found herself in a GS-7 position during October of that year.

1951 was a good year likewise for 1 statistical clerk who was in GS-5 when Washington's Birthday was celebrated. Her Thanksgiving was a happy one, she having reached the GS-9 level by that time.

<i>Division of State and Local School System</i>	
Present employees upgraded since Jan. 1, 1951 .....	26
Present employees not upgraded since Jan. 1, 1951 .....	75
Present employees in second group hired since Jan. 1, 1952 .....	12

In connection with the above record, certain observations should be made. Of 56 employees who should be termed professional, 46 are already at GS-13, or higher. Fourteen of them are Chiefs or Associate Chiefs at GS-14 and GS-15. The 32 employees at GS-13 are specialists, in various phases of education and cannot very well be upgraded without finding some area of which they can be made Chief.

A breakdown of the professional grades follows:

Three at GS-15, 11 at GS-14, 32 at GS-13, 5 at GS-12, 3 at GS-9, 1 at GS-9, 1 at GS-7. One point should be made in favor of the agency, and that is, that in the manner of hiring, regardless of the grade of the job, the individuals are uniformly well qualified for such appointments.

One result of the survey was quite evident: That the favored few who had recently been employed were advanced quite rapidly, while the employees who had served the Office of Education for many years faithfully and efficiently, received very little recognition and no promotions.

I think every Member of the House is particularly interested in the item of vocational education. The committee has made a reduction of a little over \$2½ million in the request for this item. This is a cut of less than 10 percent in the Federal appropriation, and amounts to a reduction of less than 2 percent in the total funds provided for this program in all sources, including State and local. It is the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee that this is an excellent program. However, since this program was initiated, and undoubtedly in recognition of the fact that it is an excellent program, the contribution from the States and localities has increased practically every year to the point where State and local funds now represent about 80 percent of the total spent on the program. The Federal part of the program was established, as the name states, for the promotion and further development of this program. Obviously, that purpose has been accomplished, and it is time for the Federal Government to start withdrawing its financial support, inasmuch as the program has reached that point of maturity where it can be, and should be, a State and local responsibility. However, the committee has made a very small reduction this year, to be doubly sure that no harm is done to the program.

The bill includes \$20,600,000 for vocational rehabilitation, a reduction of \$2,400,000 from the request and \$1,650,000 from the appropriation for 1953. The committee has long thought that this was an excellent program, but serious doubts have been cast on this assumption by the failure of States to support this activity. The committee has strongly urged greater State support and, according to the testimony of officials of the Office, they have done likewise but the States still are only contributing 34 cents of each dollar spent on the program. If a better basic law is required to correct this situation, the Department should take prompt action in making recommendations to the proper legislative committees.

The program of vocational education is one of the most worthwhile programs



in the Department. Unfortunately, the administration—or lack of administration—of this program leaves much to be desired. The task force which the subcommittee had checking this program found, by spot-checking 26 cases, that Federal funds were paid for the rehabilitation of individuals that, in the investigators' opinion, were not eligible for assistance. The unfortunate part was the fact that the Office did not make a protest nor an exception in a single one of these cases. For example, vocational rehabilitation funds were spent in one State for the education of a young man who had lost three toes on his right foot, but who, despite his vocational handicap, became the eastern intercollegiate wrestling champion while being rehabilitated.

Aside from vocational education, the item in this part of the bill that has aroused the greatest amount of congressional interest is the National Institutes of Health. I am sure everyone appreciates the worthiness of the research programs of the National Institutes of Health in reference to cancer, heart, mental diseases, arthritis, neurology, and blindness; and the other institutes that have been established.

The committee is recommending a total of \$61,500,000, which is about \$3 million more than the department will obligate in 1953, and more than \$5 million above the revised budget request. It is \$23,500,000 below the original 1954 request. However, after the Bureau of the Budget had submitted the 1954 estimates, President Truman added \$15 million for construction grants. Leaving out the construction item of \$15 million, the amount recommended by the committee is approximately halfway between the first and the revised budget requests for the National Institutes of Health.

The committee has allowed the amount of the revised request for operating expenses; the amount of the 1953 appropriation for the cancer, mental health, heart, dental health, and microbiology institutes; an increase of about 10 percent for arthritis and metabolic disease activities; and a very substantial increase of over 100 percent for research on neurological diseases and blindness.

The report states very explicitly that the National Institutes of Health are to concentrate their funds more on research, and less on related activities, because the committee is extremely desirous that research on these various diseases be increased. At the same time, we appreciate the limitation on expanding a program too fast. Sure, they could spend twice as much money and, frankly, I am not so sure but that they should have twice as much money for some of these activities. But this committee, like all the other subcommittees on appropriations, has to take into consideration the economic condition of the country and the balancing of the budget, and try to do everything possible to give the taxpayers of this Nation a decrease in their taxes as soon as possible.

The membership of this House is also tremendously interested in the hospital-construction program, known as the Hill-Burton program. No one in the

committee is opposed in any way to a proper hospital-construction program, properly administered. We had some men go into the department to make a survey as to how the program was being operated.

I am recommending and suggesting to the Members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that they take a good look at this report, and have some of their staff members check into it very carefully before the Hill-Burton Act is extended, in order that they will be able to offer certain amendments which I believe will strengthen the law and correct many weaknesses and deficiencies in this program.

I do not want anything I say in regard to the gentleman I am about to mention to be construed as being personally derogatory to him in any way, shape, manner, or form. The gentleman to whom I refer is Dr. Cronin, of the Public Health Service, who is charged with the responsibility of administering this program. As far as I know, Dr. Cronin is a very highly regarded and esteemed man in his profession. Nevertheless, I believe that, because this is a construction program, it should be administered by an engineer, or someone who has had years of experience in the construction business. If you needed an operation on your eye; you would certainly go to an oculist, and not a chiroprapist. I believe the program should have an engineer at the head of it.

We have found that the Department's auditors in the field, making audits on the construction of these hospitals, submit their reports to the program people, and the program people can take those reports—which they evidently have done in the past to a great extent—and throw them in the wastebasket. I think this procedure is wrong and should be corrected.

We have found in this survey that these funds, in many instances, have not been spent where there is the greatest need for hospitals. They have been spent in the areas that were able to raise money to match the Federal funds.

We had testimony before the committee that there is a tremendous shortage of doctors, nurses, and hospital attendants to staff existing hospitals. There are many deficiencies in the program that I will not take the time to discuss today.

I know the law is going to be extended and I am going to vote for extending the law, but I do hope this program will be looked at very carefully, so that some of these weaknesses can be corrected.

I do not want to leave the floor without referring to some of the publication activities of the Office of Education. The Office of Education gets out just scads and scads of publications. They have emphasized, and put out endless propaganda for, the United Nations and the UNESCO program, to the almost 100 percent exclusion of the Constitution of the United States and American history.

I am not debating today the merits or demerits of the United Nations, but in 1955 the various members of the

United Nations will have to consider revision of the United Nations Charter. How are the people going to know the weaknesses of the organization—and even the strongest boosters admit there are weaknesses—if they are not given all the facts? They get only one side of the story from the Office of Education.

I have many publications, and a list of many more, issued by the Office of Education—all propaganda for the United Nations. Why, you would think the millenium was here, from the material distributed by the Office of Education.

Just the other day, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] had a problem concerning a Communist pamphlet that was being distributed by the Hungarian Embassy to our schools throughout the United States. He wrote to Mr. Grigsby, the Acting Commissioner of Education, and asked if the Office of Education should not advise the schools concerning this publication that was propagandizing the teachers and children of our schools regarding this Communist country behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Grigsby pleaded the lack of funds, but we have scores of expensive booklets published by the Office of Education. Frankly, I doubt the need of a great many of them. Anything and everything is in them, but you cannot find mention in any bulletin of the fact that school officials should be aware of this Hungarian publication, and that it is a Communist publication. I think the new Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could well consider having someone survey the whole program.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I notice the gentleman has quite a number of the pamphlets, and apparently those are objectionable. I am sure the House would be interested in knowing the particular pamphlets, and the suggestion I wanted to make is that if you would have them listed in the RECORD, it would be of considerable help to us.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will be very glad to have them listed. There are a great many listed in the hearings, and I have many here which I did not have at the time of the hearings. I will be glad to list them at this point in the RECORD.

The titles of a portion of the pamphlets that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] requested are as follows: "How Children Learn About Human Rights"; "The U. N. Declaration of Human Rights"; "World Understanding Begins With Children"; "Teaching About the United Nations in the Schools and Colleges of the United States," published by the United States National Commission for UNESCO, Department of State; United States National Commission for UNESCO, "Teaching About the United Nations in the Schools and Colleges of the United States."

In addition, the Office of Education publishes a selected bibliography for teaching about the United Nations.



There are many others, but the above list should give anyone a pretty good idea of how they slant the propaganda in favor of the United Nations, instead of reporting objectively.

Mr. BARDEN. Some years ago, there were some most objectional pamphlets, and our Committee on Education and Labor took some steps with reference to them. It was objectionable to the recent Commissioner, Dr. McGrath, to have this type of pamphlet going out over his signature, and it was stopped. I was just interested to know if any pamphlets had gone out over Dr. McGrath's signature, which were of the objectionable type.

Mr. BUSBEY. I might say the pamphlets were secured from the Office of Education very recently.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], by his opening remarks today before this Committee, has made it difficult for me to disagree with him on many items in this appropriation bill. But, I do want to say for the benefit of the members of the committee, I have enjoyed working on this subcommittee since the 1st of February of this year under the chairmanship of FRED BUSBEY. I do not believe any chairman could have been any fairer to any member of the minority party, nor do I believe there was a witness who appeared before our committee in the 2 months or so of hearings who can say he did not get all the time he needed to explain his case. If there was ever a time in hearings on an appropriation bill, the witnesses this year had every opportunity given to them by the chairman of this committee to explain their side of the story. They were treated like gentlemen across the table. I say that in justice to the chairman of our committee. He has been very fair to those of us on the minority, and we have no fault to find at all. As he said, we may disagree on some points, but they may be disagreements of basic philosophy or they may be disagreements of what he thinks and what I think are produced by the results of the appropriations we are making in this bill.

I can sincerely reiterate what he said about our clerk. I think Bob Moyer, our clerk, who served when I was chairman of the committee, is one of the outstanding clerks of any Subcommittee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives. As far as I am concerned, he has given me all the cooperation I could possibly expect from any clerk on a Subcommittee on Appropriations during the last 3 months under the Republican administration.

It has also been a pleasure to work with the two new members on the majority side, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE]. In all the weeks of hearings I do not believe there was any politics ever brought into the hearings and in the markup of the bill itself we were able to keep politics out of it.

We also had a new member on the minority side, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ]. I appreciate

all the help that he gave me in the many hearings that have been held.

I think this is one of the most difficult appropriation bills to cut of any bill that comes before this House. Everything in this bill is directly applicable to the people of the country. The Labor Department and the new Department, Health, Education, and Welfare, each directly affects all our citizens. They affect people living today, and they affect the future welfare of our people, not only from a moral standpoint but from a physical standpoint as well. It is very difficult to cut any appropriations that we know are producing results, which the record will show, if anyone has the time to read the hearings on this particular bill.

One thing that I am disappointed in is that this is not a unanimous report from the committee. I have disagreed with the action of the majority of the committee in several instances. I believe they have gone too deep, I believe they have cut out necessary programs; and, in my opinion, that is not economy.

When we take a look at the Department of Labor, which has received an overall 20-percent cut this year, it reminds me of the same circumstances that existed in 1947, in the 80th Congress. At that time the agency in the Government that was cut most was the Department of Labor. I remember my old friend, Frank Keefe, who was chairman of the committee at that time, saying on this floor, "We have cut the Labor Department by 25 percent"—the deepest cut made in any agency of government in that fiscal year. In 1948, under the same leadership of the 80th Congress, they again bragged that they had cut the Labor Department an additional 20 percent. This year, leaving out grants to States for unemployment compensation, which is not a charge on the Federal Treasury, and leaving out the new item for unemployment compensation for veterans, this committee has cut the Department of Labor an average of 20 percent.

The Department is receiving under this administration exactly the same treatment it received from the 80th Congress. I doubt that that is going to be good for the Republican Party. But I do remember the campaign in 1948 that was put on in this country. It was brought out that the Labor Department had been picked out of all the agencies in Government and given the greatest cut of any agency existing at that time. I know that in the election of 1948, on the overall picture, it certainly did not help the Republican Party at that time.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I would prefer to continue with my statement, and then I will yield later.

In those days, 1947 and 1948, the Republicans had control of both the House and the Senate, but the Democrats still had control of the White House. This year, in 1953, when we are considering our estimates for 1954, we have a complete change from top to bottom. The Republicans have complete control of the executive branch and the legislative branch of our great country. I thought

that, having control, they would have some confidence in the appointees of the President of the United States. I thought that when the President appointed a man like Martin Durkin as Secretary of Labor, who was confirmed by the United States Senate, when he came in and made a request for funds to operate his agency in an efficient manner, because he was one of yours, an appointee of your President, you would at least give him some consideration in the request that he was making.

In the 3 or 4 volumes of printed hearings that are before you, there is not a word of testimony that justifies 1 cent of reduction in the Office of the Secretary of Labor. I think that is true almost without exception throughout the bill. I do not know of a place in the hearings you have before you today that justifies a cut whether it be in the Labor Department or the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Nothing was developed in the hearings, as far as I can see, that justified the committee cuts that have been made in this bill.

We give to the Office of the Secretary of Labor \$1,250,000. It is over \$400,000 less than you gave the Democratic Secretary of Labor in this fiscal year. You are giving less to your own people, to your own employees, and you are giving less than your own President recommends for the running of this particular office in the Department of Labor. I could understand, if you had control of the Congress and we had a Democratic Secretary of Labor, that you might cut him some 17 or 18 percent, or \$300,000 or \$400,000; but I cannot for the life of me see you cutting your own man, cutting the legs out from under your own appointee, the appointee of your own President and your party, cutting him to the extent you have.

In the Office of the Solicitor you have cut over \$400,000, yet in the course of a year that division, through its work, will take in more than we appropriate to carry them in any fiscal year. I do not know what brand of economy you call that.

The committee has given the Bureau of Labor Standards a very severe cut from nine hundred and some thousand dollars back to \$624,000, or a cut of \$374,000 below the request and \$214,000 below the appropriations for 1953.

I remember a couple of years ago that in this great basic program that is run by the Bureau of Labor Standards all the Government agencies got together and decided they would take the safety and educational features out of the Army, Navy, and every other agency of Government and put them into the Bureau of Labor Standards, because that is the place they belonged. That agency has done a wonderful job; the record of industrial accidents has been going down, down, down. Here is an agency of Government that has one of the best records, dealing with industrial accidents in our country, and you are cutting them 20 or 30 percent.

Another request the agency made in this program was funds for a study of migrant farm workers in the Midwest,



South, and Far West, farm lands who travel from State to State following the crops as they mature. I think it was testified that people engaged in such work, migrant farm labor, earn an average of about \$500 a year. They, like everybody else, have children. These children follow their fathers and mothers from State to State.

There have been commissions appointed since Herbert Hoover's time recommending that something be done about this particular problem, but there is not a State affected by this type of labor that has done anything for the children of these workers who go from State to State. When these children arrive they are not wanted by the local churches, they are not wanted by the local schools, they are not accepted in that community. They are not second-class citizens, they are third-class citizens in all of these towns they are working in at the present time.

The first commission appointed under Herbert Hoover recommended that the Federal Government do something. There have been 7 or 8 other commissions appointed over the years. They all come out with the same recommendation, that the Federal Government should take the lead in this particular problem and do something about them, provide the leadership for the States that are affected by this particular item. I remember the President saying he did not believe in second-class citizens in this country; that all citizens should be classed as first-class citizens; yet here you are allowing this tragedy to happen. We have third-class citizens who are not wanted, whose parents are working in the particular towns in the various States and we do not allow them a dime to do anything with this particular problem.

Referring now to the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, that division is a small one. It only asked for \$346,000. It has some forty-odd employees. But it is a provision that is in the Selective Service Act where every veteran that has gone to war or every reservist who has been called back to service is guaranteed his reemployment rights when discharged from the Army or when he gets out of the Reserves. Here we have a small agency of Government, the only agency in Government that guarantees the reemployment rights of the veterans, one of the smallest agencies of Government, at a time when the men are being discharged at a high rate—I have forgotten what the figure is, at the rate of a million a year more than last year—with a heavy backlog of complaints. They cannot catch up with them. These involve complaints from veterans who are having trouble getting their jobs back after getting out of the service. Yet in the face of all that, we cut this agency \$46,000, the only agency that looks after veterans and their reemployment rights. That is your answer to those veterans who are returning from the service, after the Congress of the United States in the Selective Service Act guaranteed to them that they would have reemployment rights when they returned from the service.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most surprising cuts in the Department of Labor to me was in the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training. This was one agency in the Department that in 1947 and 1948 the Republicans said we should not cut. You did not cut this agency in 1947 and 1948 because everyone agreed it was one of the best run programs in the country. It was a program that was coordinated as between management and labor. Both management and labor wanted this program continued. Yet I see advertisements in my local papers today of airplane factories on the west coast trying to get labor on the east coast to go to the west coast because they still have a shortage of mechanics in that area. This was one of the agencies of the Government that was never considered in a partisanship manner. It had the support of Republicans and Democrats alike. It had the support of labor and management in all the States and it has done a wonderful job in training apprentices during the past few years. Yet we cut that agency of Government some \$700,000. That is your answer to a program that has worked well from a nonpartisan viewpoint and from the standpoint of labor and management as well.

I go now to the Bureau of Employment Security and the Bureau of Employees' Compensation. We are allowing them \$187 million, which is a reduction of \$30 million. Now, I think every Member of the Congress knows that this is not a drain on the Federal Treasury. This fund is set up by the three-tenths of 1 percent that the employer pays into the Federal Treasury. We allocate out of this fund the amounts that are estimated to be needed in unemployment compensation payments for the next fiscal year. There is no reason or justification for this \$30 million cut at all. I have not heard a man in this country say that employment is going to be higher in 1954, but all the talk I hear around Washington today is that we are going into a recession within the next 8 or 10 or 12 or 16 months, and if we do, you are not only going to come back for a supplemental \$30 million, but you might be faced in January with a supplemental of \$50 million to reimburse this fund. We are taking in today on an average of \$60 million a year more than we are paying out of this particular fund. It seems to me with the tightening of credit, with an increase in interest rates, with a decrease in spending in the military program, that we are headed downward, and sometimes I think it is being done purposely; that the administration in power today wants unemployment, they want a surplus labor market so that they can drag down wages and get what they want out of the employees.

There is no justification for that \$30 million cut; we had no reason to cut it at all, and we know when we cut it that the agency is going to have to come back again for it in a supplemental bill. I thought we were trying to get away from supplemental bills. We already have had 2 or 3 in this session of the Congress, and will have another one by the end of June or before we get out of here this

year. This action of the committee is actually suggesting to them to come back and ask us for the money next year.

Unemployment compensation for veterans. You are giving them, probably, the original Truman budget, \$41 million, which is the revised Eisenhower budget. That is just an estimate. That might go to \$50 million, or it might go to \$35 million, no one can tell. It is just an estimate.

Salaries and expenses for the Mexican labor program. I do not know why we cut that. That only includes \$1,200,000, and it is only for 6 months, from July 1 this year until December 31, 1953, because at the time the agreement between Mexico and this country had not been renewed, and we allowed the 6 months' provision. Since that time the agreement has been renewed, and we will again have to give them the additional money to continue. But they were getting little enough out of that program, and I believe that the cut that they gave was entirely too much to make a satisfactory program down on the Mexican border.

Bureau of Employees Compensation. We cut that \$180,000. That is another agency in the Department of Labor that was not cut under the Republican administration in 1947 and 1948, because the Republican Members of the committee said then that Mr. McCauley, who was head of the division at that time, and still is, was one of the most conservative directors of any agency in the Government. He was always estimating on the conservative side. This cut of \$180,000 means that the Federal employees are going to have to wait to receive their checks when they are injured. There is no other way out of it. They cannot keep up with the program at the present time under the cut that we have made.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. We have given them almost a \$700,000 cut. That is an agency of Government that the Members of Congress use; it is the agency of Government that private industry uses; it is the agency of Government that labor unions use when they have that escalator clause in their union-management contracts. That is one agency that I think has done a splendid job, and I think that is too much of a cut.

Now we come down to the Women's Bureau. There is only one agency in government that can give help to the working women of this country. We have at the present time in this country about 20 million women who are working. This small agency in Washington is the only agency of our Government where these 20 million women workers today can get any advice, leadership, or help regarding their working conditions or the problems they are facing.

It has been almost an annual appropriation in this bill. Once in a while we might cut them \$5,000 or \$10,000, but we never cut them as much as \$60,000, which is about a 17 percent cut. Here you are cutting one of the smallest agencies of the Government, the only agency of the Government that



has anything to do with the working conditions of 20 million women in this country, and you are cutting them 17 percent.

You cut the wage-hour division \$1,639,000, one of the largest cuts you have made in the Department of Labor. We cut them quite severely a couple of years ago and a year ago. I think, although I am not sure, that they are now about 50 percent below what they were 3 or 4 years ago. If you do not want the minimum wage laws lived up to in this country, if you do not want the Walsh-Healey Act enforced in this country, why not repeal the laws instead of taking money away from the agency so it cannot enforce the laws? Why go in the back door like this and cripple their enforcement procedures? Let us face it. Let us come out and say there is a change in this administration, that we are not for this law or that law. Let us either amend it or get rid of it. Let us be men about it and not come in through the back door and cut their appropriations to such an extent that they cannot enforce the provisions Congress has voted during the past 3 or 4 years. There are 600,000 or 700,000 business establishments in this country. They can visit only 35,000 out of this number at the present time with what they have to work with.

As far as the Labor Department is concerned, to me it is an exact replica of the 80th Congress in 1947, when we were before this committee, but instead of cutting it 25 percent, as you did in 1947, you cut it only 20 percent this year.

As to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we have another appointee of the President of the United States in a new Secretary for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby. I never met Mrs. Hobby until she appeared before our committee. She appeared before our committee I think on three occasions, and those were the three occasions I had the pleasure of talking with her.

I remember the first time, my friend from Illinois and the other Republican members of the committee told her what a great job she was doing and what a great job they expected her to do, and how glad they were that there was a change in the old Federal Security Administration.

I said in a committee meeting that when I was chairman of this committee, whenever we got down to the office of the Secretary or the Administrator, as it was called then, when Oscar Ewing was the Administrator, there was not much I could do about it because the Republicans and the Democrats on the subcommittee for 4 years did not have much use for Oscar Ewing, and they just indiscriminately cut every year. It was an across-the-board cut. If it was a 15-percent cut, some might say 20 percent, and then, "Oh, let's make it a 25-percent cut." That is the way it went for 4 or 5 years.

His office was cut on an average of 20 percent to 25 percent because of a clash of personalities and because they did not like the way Oscar Ewing ran the office.

That is why his office appropriations were cut. Then lo and behold a few weeks ago, we were called upon to vote to make the Federal Security Administration a cabinet post. We made Mrs. Hobby the first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and at the same time we voted to make her a cabinet officer. We also voted to give her additional funds under the reorganization act making it a cabinet post. I do not know how many additional positions were given her—I have forgotten now—I think it involves in the neighborhood of \$30,000 or \$40,000. She appeared before our committee. I think she is a very able woman. I think she can do a good job if given the tools to work with. She came before our committee requesting additional funds which were in the request. I have forgotten the amount she requested, but when we marked up the bill, it did not make any difference whether she requested \$5,000 or \$50,000, the answer was: "No. We are going to give you just what we gave Oscar Ewing in 1953." That is not the whole story. We are giving her less. You men and women who have been fighting men of the Oscar Ewing type in this country by cutting their funds did not give her what you gave Oscar Ewing under a Democratic administration. There was \$30,000 or \$40,000 in additional jobs that she asked for. There were the Ramspeck promotions to be put into effect. There was another item that I cannot think of at the moment, but we actually are cutting the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare more than \$100,000, and are actually giving her \$100,000 less in 1954 than you gave Oscar Ewing to operate in 1953. I do not know what you call that. I do not know how to express myself. I do not know what words to use. But, it seems to me if she was the appointee under a Democratic administration and I was part and parcel of that administration, I would want to give her a chance to do a job. I would want to give her the tools to work with. Then in a year or two, after we had a chance to examine the record, we could then determine whether we were right or wrong in giving her more or less than she asked for to run her particular office.

There is also in that particular office a mandate from the President of the United States that a security office be set up. If that is going to be set up in that Cabinet post, it means there will be a further cut to absorb it—and I presume there will be. They are not going to have the money to set it up unless they take it away from something else that they are now doing. Is that the way you are going to treat the appointees of your President? There was nothing in the hearings that justified such a cut as we have given her office. I thought she made a splendid presentation. I think she has ability. I think she can do a job, but you are not letting her do a job by taking the action you have taken by cutting her immediate office to that extent. It is unbelievable to me that you did not give her enough or as much as you gave Oscar Ewing when he was the target of 90 percent of the Members of Congress over the

past 4 or 5 years. I cannot believe that such an action is possible. I could not believe my ears when I heard the majority of the committee say that they were going to cut out these requests of their new Cabinet officer. I am in favor of giving her the money to operate with, and let her do a good job. I think she can do it if she gets the proper help and the proper money to work with.

Now, in the Food and Drug Administration the Republican administration in the 80th Congress did not make a cut. On both sides of the aisle in those days we believed this was an agency which protects what you eat and drink, and the drugs you buy in the drugstores all over the country. It affects every living person in this country, in the work they are doing at the present time. Because of that we never cut them. Lo and behold, this year we take away from them \$663,000, the biggest cut they have ever received since I have been a member of this committee. It is the one agency in Government that protects us in the food we eat, the water we drink, and the medicine we use for medicinal purposes.

How many times, day in and day out, in the course of a year do we read in the newspapers that the Food and Drug Administration has seized this particular drug off the shelves of the drugstores all over the country, because it was dangerous to people. How many times have we read in the papers of this article of food which had been seized because it was rancid or poisonous? That is what the Department is doing with this money. They are protecting you and me and every other living person in the country at the present time. Yet you are going to cut that particular agency, one of the most important in the Government, by over \$600,000.

Freedmen's Hospital and Howard University: I do not know why we cut them so much. We cut Howard University over \$500,000. We cut Freedmen's Hospital over \$400,000. I think everyone in the country knows that Howard University has come of age, you might say, in recent years, because we have been giving them the funds with which to build buildings and to provide teachers. Their standing among the colleges of this country has risen year after year to the point where they are an outstanding college at the present time. It is practically the only college in the country where the Negro can get an education. Freedmen's Hospital is part and parcel of Howard University as a medical hospital.

In the Office of Education, you have cut vocational training \$2,600,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I want to finish as soon as I can and then I will yield to everyone.

The so-called revised item in our budget originally cut this item \$4 million—from \$18 million down to \$14 million. Then the committee came out with an in-between figure, between 14 million and 18 million, 16,048,000, and refused to allow any funds for distributive education. It seems to me that is



too much of a reduction in vocational education. I say that for this reason: In the next item, further endowment of colleges of agriculture, the bill does not include any item for that at all. They reduce that by \$2,500,000. In my opinion that is legislation on an appropriation bill. When we cut out entirely an amount like that, we disallow the entire amount. It affects every land-grant college in every State in the Union. In my own little State of Rhode Island, it means a cut of \$27,000. The legislature has already adjourned. How can a little college like that make up that loss? I do not know what the amounts are in the other State colleges, but it affects them in almost every State in the Union.

When the new Secretary was before us she had a letter from the Bureau of the Budget where they cut this item I think 50 percent; I think the letter so stated. That letter was dated April 9. In another letter dated April 13 the budget people reversed themselves and gave the agency a little better than \$2,500,000, and the reason they gave was that the program was established in 1935. In other words, in other years we have been giving this, of course, as an annual appropriation, not touching it or reducing it one dime year after year between 1935 and 1953. Further consideration should have been given before this cut was made if it was intended to turn the responsibilities back to the States, for the legislatures of 41 out of the 48 States have adjourned and will not convene for 2 years unless they are called back into emergency session. The Congress should give the States some advance notice, 2 or 3 years, but the committee said "No." They did not agree with the Bureau of the Budget and decided to cut it out entirely. That is what they have done, and that is all you have before you. You have cut out this \$2,500,000 entirely, yet the legislatures in 41 of the 48 States will not meet again for 2 years unless called into special session, which is the prerogative of the Governor or the constituted authorities in each particular State.

Salary expenses for the Office of Education: You cut them \$750,000, which is \$460,000 below what they had this fiscal year and what we are giving them at the present time, 1953. I did not blame Dr. McGrath for resigning his office 3 or 4 weeks ago. I think if I had been in his place I would have done the same thing. I think it took a lot of guts and courage to do what he did after the treatment his Department received at the hands of the Congress in the supplemental bill that we passed only a few months ago. You remember he fought hard to restore a couple of hundred thousand dollars for the Department of Education to carry on their responsibilities under the new GI bill of rights or the Korean GI bill of rights. You remember last June or July we passed the so-called GI bill of rights after a couple of years of extensive hearing by the so-called Teague committee. I think they did a wonderful job. They made an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Education to run the program so that we would not have

those fly-by-night schools that existed during World War II. We eliminated all of that and a few other things that Members of Congress were complaining about. This was done after extensive hearings. But we adjourned at the end of June or early in July without having given them any funds. When that happens they go to the Bureau of the Budget. The Budget told them to go ahead and spend up to \$200,000, which they did; and it was only right that they should. They hired some forty-odd employees. They came to us in a supplemental bill, as they should have, and you voted them down a short while ago when you voted against that bill.

When you voted against that amount in the supplemental bill it meant the firing of 41 employees they had working on this program at that time. They had to fire every one of them. In addition, they had to fire about 30 more employees in the Department of Education, and on top of that, because we refused to give them the money, every employee in the Department of Education was going to be forced to take a 2 weeks' furlough without pay before the end of June in order to make up this program. Since that time I understand a request has gone to the Senate to include the \$40,000 to make sure that these employees who are left at the present time will not have to take a furlough. If you were the head of the Department of Education and got treated like that after you had lived up to the express will of Congress, how would you feel? I commend Dr. Earl McGrath for resigning as he did and refusing to appear before the Senate Committee on Appropriations with a revised budget that he knew was not sufficient to carry on the educational facilities that we had promised the educators of this country for advice and technical assistance in the elementary and higher grades of education all over the Nation. On top of that, we cut the Office of Education an additional \$460,000.

Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: I remember the Secretary telling us in our committee that this is one agency she thought should not be cut. But we did cut it by \$2,400,000.

This is one of the few agencies of Government that produces income to the Government. It has been testified that over the years for every dollar we appropriate for vocational rehabilitation the Federal Treasury receives \$10 back in one form or another; 25 or 30 percent of those who are rehabilitated are taken off public-assistance rolls or relief rolls of the cities, towns, and States. Here is an agency of Government that is making a return of 10 to 1 for every dollar we appropriate. Do you call it economy to cut that agency \$2,400,000 when such a cut is going to result in a cost to the Government of over \$3 million? Also, it is going to deny 7,000 people in this country, in the next fiscal year, the chance to get a job for themselves and the opportunity to pay their own way. That is not economy. That is just an attempt to show an overall savings in our governmental expenditure regardless of the ill effect attained. That is all it amounts to.

I know the committee expresses some doubt about certain of the programs and about some of the individuals who have been rehabilitated. I have had an opportunity to check into some of these cases, and I do not think that the charges are substantiated at all. In my opinion, they are not substantiated. Although there are three cases appearing on page 10 of the report, our committee does not know a thing about them. The only thing I know about them is that some investigator was sent down there, and I know this by reading about it. It seems to me that if we had been advised of conditions like that, we, as a committee appropriating the funds, should immediately call up to our committee the responsible people and determine for ourselves who is right and who is wrong. Is it justified or is not justified? We should make the determination for ourselves. I do not know who this investigator was. I do not know his background. I have no idea where he got his material, nor do I know how far he went. I do not know whether he went back to the States to investigate or not. I do not believe he did.

By this cut of \$2,400,000 you are actually costing the Federal Government close to a million dollars, and you are prohibiting the rehabilitation of about 7,000 people in the next fiscal year.

I come now to the Public Health Service. Outside of the National Institutes of Health, involving cancer, the heart, neurology, blindness, arthritis, rheumatism, mental health, and general health, we have made some rather severe reductions. We cut the venereal-disease item \$3,325,000, allowing that branch only \$5 million. A lot of people ask, What about that? You can do something about it. But there is not a doctor in this world who knows how to prevent it. The medical men in this country do not know how to prevent it, and as long as we live, unless we find a way to prevent it, we are going to have it with us; and the only way to get the cases down is to find them and have them treated with the new drugs that have been made available by research under some of these programs in past years. But we have no right to cut its funds down that much and take a chance on the disease spreading further than it is at the present time, and that is what we are doing.

The same thing is true with tuberculosis. We gave that unit a severe cut. We have no cure for tuberculosis at the present time, none whatsoever; we cannot prevent it, and the only thing we can do is to find the people that have it, that transmit it, and get them into the hospitals, and with the new drugs that have been available cure them and get them out. We can cure them if we can get them in time, but the job is to find them at the present time and not allow the disease to be transmitted or carried from person to person. Everyone knows it is highly contagious.

Communicable diseases: We gave that agency one of the most severe cuts by reducing it over \$700,000. I do not know what some of the States of the Union would do if we did not have this agency. Whenever an epidemic breaks out that



is beyond their control, whom do they look to? To this agency, to help them out, and they are working on this thing day in and day out.

Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: We gave them a reduction of almost a million dollars. This agency has something to do with the water that you drink, with the pollution of streams. It is the health agency of the country. It is not a State problem; it is a national problem. It is not intrastate; it is interstate, and if the Federal Government does not take the lead, the States are not going to follow through as they are now in cooperation with the Federal Government. If we hit them like this, there are States that will not be able to carry on the work that they have been doing, and the people will suffer.

Hospital-construction program: The Eisenhower budget cut this from \$75 million to \$60 million and the committee cut it another \$10 million, which is a 33-percent reduction. This bill runs out in 1955. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has introduced a bill to extend it another 5 years, and Senator TAFT and Senator HILL, in a nonpartisan move in the Senate, have suggested the same amendment. This program was started 8 years ago, 1945, for a 5-year period. There was not a vote against it in the House of Representatives; I do not know about the Senate. It was a nonpartisan move on this side. In 1950, we not only extended the act for another 5 years but we increased the authorization from \$75 million to \$150 million without a dissenting vote; not a dissenting vote in the House of Representatives on either side of the aisle. It was a nonpartisan approach, because every State in the Union could get some help under this program. The statistics that we had in our hearings do not justify a cut of one dime. There is not a place in the hearings that you can put your finger on that justifies a cut of one dime in the hospital-construction program. It has been one of the best run programs of any program of the Federal Government. It is strictly a State program, you people who are talking about States' rights. The States themselves determine where these hospitals are going to be built. They have a State planning commission. The local communities are the local groups that sponsor these hospitals. They have to clear through the State planning commission, so it is almost completely a State organization and a State program only with supervision, from an architectural standpoint, from the Federal Government and the Federal Government audits the Federal payments. That is about all that we do. I feel that it is necessary to provide good, decent hospitals in some of these communities.

When we talked a few years ago about the shortage of doctors in this country, and some people wanted socialized medicine, the hue and cry was then that there are plenty of doctors but we cannot get them to go into these rural areas. This is a rural program. Since these hospitals have been built, doctors have gone into them because they have

the facilities and they have a place to work.

One criticism was made in this report that we are taking nurses out of existing institutions. Maybe some are, but about 20-some percent of nurses working in these hospitals that have been built under this program have come out of retirement. They were retired and this program has got them back as nurses. In communities that never had any facility at all for a doctor to work in, there are now some 1,200 hospital projects that are working at the present time. Of these 1,200 that are operating, only 3 have received adverse comment. There was a small one in the Midwest somewhere. It was not a construction problem at all. It was for equipment, \$17,000 or \$18,000. The Federal Government is going to get that money back. There are two other small ones that are closed because of difficulties within the States, that we expect will be opened within the near future.

In my opinion, this reduction is one of the worst mistakes that the committee made, in cutting the appropriation from \$75 million to \$50 million. I am sure when the amendment is offered tomorrow that regardless of politics—and there will be no politics in it because every State in the Union wants this continued, and I am convinced as I stand here that it is going to be continued another 5 years after 1955—this will carry because we will have support on both sides of the aisle.

As to the hospital and medical program, we reduced this figure \$2,724,000 from the request and \$1,188,000 from the appropriation for 1953. That means the closing of at least four hospitals, and maybe more. It means the closing of a hospital in New Mexico, it means the closing of a hospital in Cleveland, it means the closing of a hospital in Savannah, Ga., and it means the closing of a hospital in Memphis, Tenn. This cut means just that, and they may have to close one more. If the hospital at Memphis, Tenn., is closed, and the hospital at Savannah, Ga., is closed, there will not be a Marine or Public Health hospital between New Orleans and Norfolk or between New Orleans and Chicago. In the entire southeastern area of our country there will not be one Public Health or Marine hospital left if we allow this cut to stand as it is at the present time.

We have evidence that the Public Health hospitals are run more cheaply than any other hospital group in the country. They are run cheaper than those operated by private or nonprofit groups in Washington or any other place in the country. They are run much cheaper than the Veterans' hospitals. We have the most efficient program here in hospitals under the Public Health Service of the entire group, private, nonprofit, or veterans. Yet here we are forcing them to close 2 or 3 hospitals that are needed at the present time.

As to the National Institutes of Health, involving research on cancer, mental health, heart, dental, arthritis, microbiology, neurology and blindness,

as the chairman said, we compromised on that. It is not as much as I would like to see in that appropriation. I think we should be appropriating more for research in cancer, mental health, heart, arthritis, neurology and blindness. If there was ever a program that the Federal Government was entitled to be in, it is this program. I think we should be appropriating much more for research in these particular programs because this research has paid off. We have listened to the testimony of all the heads of these Institutes, and on top of that at the end of the hearings we called in some of the outstanding doctors in the particular fields of heart disease, cancer, mental health, neurology and blindness. Every one of them—none connected with the Federal Government—appeared before us and urged us to appropriate more than the Truman budget. I was one of those who agreed with them that we should. We could save money in the end if we did appropriate more. I do not know how much the Veterans' Administration is paying out now for mentally ill veterans. I think it is in the neighborhood of \$700 million a year. That is just for the Veterans' Administration—over \$700 million a year. But through research, if we find the answer, we can save the Federal Government money in the end. Over 50 percent of the hospital beds in this country are taken up by mentally ill people. There is not a family in this country who does not have one member affected by heart disease or some phase of mental ailment or cancer or one of the forms of neurological diseases, arthritis and rheumatism, or some things that we know nothing about such as muscular dystrophy and multiple sclerosis and things like that. All the doctor can tell a person who has such diseases is how much time he can expect to live. Medical science has no idea what causes these diseases, and yet thousands of people are dying. That is a proper field for the Federal Government to be in. It is a program that we should be spending more money on than we are at the present time. It would give us ten times the return we are now getting.

The next item is the National Railroad Retirement Board. We show a reduction of \$18 million there. I do not know why. We have nothing to do with it at all. It is a fund that is paid by the employer and the employee. It does not mean a thing. I do not know why we did not give it all to them because there is nothing we can do about it. We have no control over it at all.

The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is the next item. There is a reduction of \$500,000. I thought Mr. Cole, who, by the way, was a Republican, gave an excellent explanation of the need for these funds.

The National Labor Relations Board, which is your "baby," was cut \$800,000. They have a backlog of cases at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has consumed 1 hour.



Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the gentleman from Rhode Island may continue for 10 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I am glad, Mr. Chairman, to have the first opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island for his wonderful presentation of the problems here involved. I agree with him that too much damage has been done to the general welfare by these proposed cuts. I am hopeful that many of the cuts may be restored. I should like to mention a subject which has been discussed by the gentleman, and that is vocational education.

This bill cuts 14 percent below the original budget figure, from \$18,673,261 down to \$16,048,870. There are thousands of boys and girls throughout the United States, particularly in eastern Kentucky and throughout the South, and all over the Nation, unable to go to college. In high school many of them are being taught a trade or some vocation that is profitable to them in their later years. An amendment will be offered to restore this figure to the original budget figure of \$18,673,261. I, for one, intend to support that amendment, along with numerous other amendments in order that we may try to make some needed corrections in this measure when we read the bill tomorrow. Again I wish to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I likewise want to thank the gentleman for his wonderful explanation of the bill. I would like to ask one or two particular questions for information. Could the gentleman give me any idea as to how much the program for what we call future farmers of America would suffer if the proposed recommendation of the committee is carried out in this reduction for vocational education?

Mr. FOGARTY. All I can tell you is that a reduction of over \$2 million would take care of the home economic group, the agricultural group. There is no provision in the bill for distributive education.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But it would cut down tremendously on that great program, what we call the future farmers of America and the future homemakers of America?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In my own district, the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, we have the University of Florida. The State legislature has recently appropriated \$5 million for a great medical school. Certainly one of the great problems of this Nation is to train doctors and nurses to take care of the needs of our people. I wonder, if this recom-

mendation prevails, if they would have trouble in getting money under the Hall-Burton Act to get the necessary matching funds which they will need to build that great medical school. On page 11 of the committee's report it gives some information about this particular point.

Mr. FOGARTY. As far as I know, if the committee action stands, you will have no chance at all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Just one other question, and I apologize for taking so much time, but I wanted to say that my own particular State would lose \$47,640 if aid is denied these Federal land-grant colleges. I would like to say that our great Negro university in the State of Florida—I know the gentleman did not mean to suggest that Howard University was the only Negro school in the country—that great college would lose, and the president has written me protesting that particular cut.

Mr. FOGARTY. I understand an amendment will be offered to restore that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is so well informed I would like to ask him a question regarding construction, maximum security building. It is in the report on page 15:

The bill contains none of the \$195,000 requested for plans and specifications for construction of a new maximum security building. While there is some justification for such a building, the committee is not disposed to recommend any further appropriations for buildings so long as Federal patients are a minor part of the patient load and Federal funds bear 100 percent of the cost of construction.

This is in connection with the maximum security building which was to have been erected at St. Elizabeths. It is suggested here that they will not pay anything because the Federal patient load is a minor part of the load. That is almost legislation on an appropriation bill, is it not?

Mr. FOGARTY. I would not say that, no. The committee has felt that perhaps the District of Columbia should run this hospital. The gentleman is talking about St. Elizabeths Hospital?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. A great percentage of the load there are District of Columbia patients. The Government should be paying more, or they should run it entirely. I am not positive myself but I think maybe that should be done eventually.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But in the meantime there is tremendous crowding at St. Elizabeths.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is a very crowded institution.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And a very dangerous situation.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman. Better provision should be made for that institution. Perhaps the Senate can do something on this matter.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I wish to compliment the gentleman on what is undoubtedly the finest presentation I have heard on the floor of this House. I understand that requirements under Public Law 874 are constantly increasing, of necessity, and I would like to know how the cut in the funds for Public Law 874 will affect our children in these federally impacted areas throughout the United States in every State of the Union.

Mr. FOGARTY. It will mean exactly this: That the Congress of the United States will not be living up to its commitments under the present law. We will not be able to pay 100 percent of their entitlement; we will be able to pay under this bill only about 87 percent of their entitlement. An amendment will be offered tomorrow to correct that too.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In Oklahoma we carry on more vocational education and rehabilitation work than in nearly any State of its size. I have a letter here from J. B. Perkins, State director of vocational education, which shows the cuts which will be effected in Oklahoma, and on behalf of the entire membership of the Oklahoma delegation I would like to offer it.

I also have a letter from Mr. Skerlock, head of the rehabilitation work in Oklahoma, showing cuts there. I would like to call the committee's attention to the fact that \$11,792 to promote vocational education, also \$30,700,000 grants to the States are really reductions in unemployment compensation for veterans and also the items of payments to States under the office of vocational rehabilitation amounting to \$2,400,000, and another one for \$225,000; and, furthermore, I would like to agree with the gentleman from Rhode Island in his statements as to this great loss and also agree with him as to the great advantage of these programs.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Do I understand that the Institute for Neurological Diseases covers research in cerebral palsy?

Mr. FOGARTY. It does.

Mr. CELLER. Has there been any reduction in funds for research concerning cerebral palsy?

Mr. FOGARTY. This is a new institution that was created by Congress about 3 years ago. We are increasing funds for the work of this institute yearly but it is not as much as we would like to have it. The work of this institute affects about 20 million people in this country.

Mr. CELLER. Is the \$4 million an increase over the past year?

Mr. FOGARTY. It is about a 100-percent increase.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to ask the gentleman about funds for grants to States for the administration of the un-



employment-security program. Did the gentleman deal with that in his statement?

Mr. FOGARTY. I did. I said we had given it a substantial cut without anyone having come before the committee and saying we were going to have the full employment we have had. Our action is simply asking them to come back with a further request for funds in a supplemental bill next January.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to thank the gentleman. That is the information I have from our own State commission on labor in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island has consumed 1 hour and 11 minutes.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I was not able to be present at more than a few of the committee hearings on this bill because of the fact that my Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations sat at the same time. Being chairman of that subcommittee it was impossible, of course, for me to be at both places at the same time. I did, however, participate with the full committee in the markup of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have read a considerable portion of the hearings on this bill since it was marked up by the full committee. I have the highest praise for the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] who has as big a heart, I am sure, as any Member of this House. He conducted the hearings in a very fine manner. Everyone who wanted to speak had the opportunity to be heard. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE], another member of the subcommittee, is a very outstanding gentleman and one who has the welfare of suffering humanity in mind. He is sympathetic toward everything and everyone involved in this bill. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is a capable, patriotic American, a Member for whom I have the very highest regard. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ], another member of the subcommittee, was very diligent in attending the hearings and I am sure, when opportunity presents itself, he will tell this committee that he is in practically perfect agreement with the committee in marking up this bill. However, I shall let him speak for himself at the proper time.

Mr. Chairman, this is the sort of bill that one can make a most appealing speech about. Any Member of the House can stand up here and expound his feelings and philosophies with reference to the need for taking care of people who require care, the sick, the disabled; in other words all of those who might receive benefits under this bill. May I say that I yield to no Member in a desire to do everything I can, everything we can afford to do, for suffering humanity.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in everything the gentleman has said. He has cooperated to the fullest extent in the past, and he gave me in past years valuable assistance in the offering of amendments. When we came to public health he was always agreeable to public health and has always been of help to this committee as far as the public health of the Nation is concerned.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, there are many activities involved in this bill. Some cuts have been made, yes, but actually they are very minor. I feel that Mr. Durkin is a very able administrator, and I believe he can take the funds which the committee has allowed in this bill and do a much better job than has been done in years past for the Department of Labor. We have good reason to believe he can do that because the Secretary of Labor comes to us highly recommended by not only the laboring people of America, but by many of the industrialists, the employers, who have known him for many years. So, we have complete confidence that Secretary Durkin can operate under the provisions of this bill to the complete satisfaction of the labor unions and of the employers.

I think you will all agree that Mrs. Hobby is a very sincere, conscientious American, who wants to do a good job. And I am sure that she will. Mrs. Hobby recognizes the fact that we have a terrific national debt. Our national income is going down, and unless every dollar is saved in every department the day may come, and it may come sooner than many of us think, when the Congress will be forced to deny funds for many of these worthwhile programs that we are appropriating these huge sums for today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I hope that the Committee on Appropriations next year will put first things first, and I hope the Committee on Appropriations will bring in first the defense spending bill, so-called, and, second, the foreign WPA spending bill. Let us find out how much we are going to give to these foreign leeches before we start cutting off our own people. Let us put first things first next year.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

In line with that, I must say that so long as we are spending the billions of dollars for national defense, as well as helping people all over the world who want to be free, it is certainly necessary for us, in order to keep this Nation solvent, to spend the least that we dare spend for things here at home. All of us wish we could spend more for the needy and those old folks whose earning capacity has ended; for such things as flood control, which is a Federal responsibility that the people back home cannot handle with their own funds; for the disabled veterans who have been fighting our wars for past decades and who are now hospitalized in this country; for the widows and orphans, for those

whose husbands and fathers have been maimed or diseased because of these terrible wars. Those are some things we have to think about. I hope and pray that all of us will be concerned about how we spend the taxpayers' dollars.

I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] on this bill, and I listened with a great deal of interest. I know he is sincere in everything he does and everything he says. I wonder, however, how the gentleman can justify the cuts that were made last year below the budget when he was chairman of the committee. I note that the budget estimate for 1953 was \$1,983,410,861, and the gentleman and his committee reduced that figure to \$1,786,086,161, a cut of \$197,324,700.

This year when the budget request was \$2,098,062,861 the committee allowed \$1,965,581,570, a cut of \$132,481,291, as against the cut the committee made last year under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] of \$197,324,700.

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman will yield, I do not think we can determine anything from total figures, because there are sometimes programs of two or three hundred millions in one year and out the next, as in the bill we are facing now we had \$195 million for school construction and we do not have that now.

Last year the major cut was made in grants to States for public assistance, and I will tell you why. Two years before we had cut that program \$50 million, and the Senate cut an additional \$100 million, which was a cut of \$150 million. That year because of changes in the Social Security Act they did not need a supplemental, so last year on the basis of that record we cut that fund \$150 million. But we were wrong.

Mr. JENSEN. That was a phony cut, then?

Mr. FOGARTY. It turned out to be, yes, but we were going on what happened the year before. They were able to work with \$150 million less. So we put it in the same year, but we found out we were wrong, just as in the case of unemployment compensation in this bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman contend there are some phony cuts in this bill this year?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not like to call them phony, but there is no justification for cutting the unemployment compensation fund \$30 million. The president of the State Association for Unemployment Security appeared before our committee and said he needed every dime of it. Every one of these State agencies has said they needed this. We have had to come back with a supplemental. If you do not call it unreasonable—I do not like to call it a phony cut—maybe it is a little misjudgment or something like that. But I am sure as I stand here that we are going to be faced with a supplemental next January of at least this amount and maybe more.

Mr. JENSEN. Then, according to your statement, the cuts will actually amount, outside of the item we just mentioned, to about \$100 million below the budget. Will the gentleman agree that



the committee did meet all of the health items in this bill comparable to the amounts that were provided last year?

Mr. FOGARTY. I believe I said that when I made my statement.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that we even appropriated more?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right in some cases.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, as a Democrat, I would like to see this bill passed as it is presently constituted, without a single change, because I know that if it is passed in this shape it would mark the defeat of the Republican Party in the elections of next year and would see my party back in control of the House by 50 to 100 votes. But, as an American, I hope that tomorrow we cast aside partisanship and get down to the business of putting a good, solid floor under this country. My distinguished colleague said he would like to see the defense and foreign appropriation bills come before us first—he used the phrase “foreign leaches”—I do not go that far. But I do say that, outside of our moral and spiritual backbone, the first line of defense of this country is public health, and the second line of defense is public education. No amount of armament and foreign assistance can make up for a lack of those two items. We have not a friend in the world. Our only dependable ally is American youth. Today you would destroy them through this bill.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] on his magnificent analysis of this bill. I want to get down now to the business of talking about 2 or 3 items.

I would like to say that in the five terms that I have been in the Congress I have never seen such a flagrant act of discrimination as that perpetrated by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee in cutting out all assistance to land-grant colleges, in cutting the budget of Howard University by 54 percent, and in cutting the budget of Freedmen's Hospital by 18 percent. This bill is discrimination at its worst. It is anti-democratic, antieducation, antipublic health, anti-Negro, anti-President Eisenhower, anti-Mrs. Hobby, and anti-common sense.

The President of the United States has just received within the last 48 hours specific recommendations from the National Manpower Council as regards what we in America must do in order to train more brain power for the future of this Nation. This subcommittee, on the other hand, has cut in half the appropriations for such brain power at one of our Nation's leading universities, Howard University, and cut out all money for land-grant colleges. I do not believe the majority of the Members of this House have full knowledge of this act. I hope that tomorrow you will restore at least the recommendations made by President Eisenhower and Mrs. Hobby.

The House recommendation is \$475,000 less than the Eisenhower budget recommendation.

The House recommendation is \$2,615,000 or 54 percent less than the Truman budget recommendation.

This 54 percent cut is part of a 4.96 percent cut. This means that the Howard University percentage cut is nearly 11 times as large as the average percentage cut for the whole Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and is twice as large as the next highest percentage cut in the Department. The next highest are: First, Public Health, 23.5 percent; second, Freedmen's Hospital, 18 percent; and, third, Office of Education, 16.4 percent.

The committee cuts salaries and expenses for current instruction \$295,000 below the Eisenhower budget recommendation; \$435,000 below the actual 1953 appropriation; and \$510,000 below the Truman budget recommendation.

It cuts out entirely the preparation of plans for steam and electric utilities services to the new medical building—\$25,000.

It cuts out entirely the \$30,000 needed to complete the plans and specifications for the new preclinical medical building.

It denies \$150,000 for a new turbo generator for electricity, recommended by both Truman and Eisenhower Directors of the Budget and orders a change in policy from the production of power by its own plant to the purchase of power commercially, although we are expertly advised that, first, the installation of heavy switchgear for private power will cost more than the turbo-generator; and second, that commercial power will cost as much as \$36,000 per annum more than privately produced power.

It withheld funds for the construction of the law building and thereby imperils the accreditation of the law school.

The university is now operating with 42 buildings. Thirteen of these are temporary wooden buildings, a fire hazard and dangerous to life. The city of Washington will not give a permit to use them longer than a 2-year period.

Fifteen others are declared by Public Buildings Service to be unfit for permanent use.

Only 14 of the present 42 buildings, therefore, are fit for safe and permanent use.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Under salaries and expenses the committee has recommended a sum of \$2,240,000. This is \$295,000 less than the sum recommended by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; is \$435,000 less than the appropriation in 1953; and is \$510,000 less than the original 1954 estimates.

The effect of this cut will be drastically destructive. In one blow it will cancel all of the money appropriated by the Congress of the United States for the improvement of instruction at Howard University over a period of 10 years, and will place the quality of instruction in a position inferior to that which prevailed in 1943. Since 1943 the congressional appropriations have been directed

mainly toward the provision of, first, personnel and facilities for increased student numbers; and, second, salary increases to overcome the heavy advance of inflation. During this period less than \$300,000 of all income has been applied directly to the purpose of improving the quality of instruction. The proposed cut will wipe out all this gain, at one stroke.

A careful study of the university budget shows that this cut will require a net loss of 66 persons of whom 50 will be teachers, and of these 42 must be dropped from the faculty of the college of liberal arts or 32.4 percent of this faculty. This will leave 87.5 teachers for 1978 students. The teaching ratio will then be increased from 15.3 students for each teacher, to 23 students for each teacher. This would put them back below where they stood in 1948 and would represent almost a 100-percent weakening of the student-teacher relation achieved in 1943, namely, 12.5 to 1.

The loss of teachers in the College of Liberal Arts will be only one aspect of the problem thus precipitated. If the House committee report is adopted, it will not only require, first, a 32.4 percent reduction in personnel in the College of Liberal Arts with resulting deterioration in the quality of instruction; but, second, it will also require a reduction of \$215,000 in salaries, with resulting deterioration of morale throughout the university. This salary cut can be avoided only by cutting the teaching staff by an additional 38 persons, making a total cut of 88 teachers. The university cannot stand such a cut at all. It would imperil the accreditation of every school and college in the university.

In making this drastic reduction in salaries and expenses the House committee has used as its base of departure the appropriation made in 1948 for the peak enrollment of 6,268 full-time students. The years 1947 and 1948 were peak years of enrollment, due to the heavy enrollment of returned soldiers. But this peak was served during both these years at a great sacrifice in the quality of educational service. In 1947 the service rendered to the students was \$236 per student, or 37 percent inferior in quality to the instruction given in 1943; and the service rendered to the students in 1948 was \$91, or 14 percent inferior in quality to the instruction given in 1943. If the peak enrollment in 1948 had been served with the same efficiency as the enrollment in 1943, the university would have been obliged to expend \$4,587,463 in the four categories of educational and general as compared with an actual expenditure of \$3,492,944. This means that the educational service rendered the 6,268 students in 1948 fell below the teaching efficiency of 1943 by \$1,048,469. The use of this low point of efficiency as a standard is, in effect, to abandon the entire qualitative purpose which the Government has been pursuing at Howard University. It has the further effect also of penalizing the university for the strenuous effort it made to serve the heavy load of returned soldiers in 1947 and 1948.



The reduction in appropriation for salaries and expenses recommended by the House committee not only injures greatly the College of Liberal Arts but causes an indefinite postponement of the purpose to establish instruction and research toward the degree of doctor of philosophy on a sound basis; moreover, it practically destroys the qualitative foundation of the present master's degree. It may effectively smother the entire program for graduate work at Howard University for a period of years.

It is further clear from the committee's report that none of the following increases within the appropriation were allowed:

1. Installation of transformer vault and wiring necessary to furnish AC current to Freedmen's Hospital .....	\$40,000
2. Retubing of oil-fired boiler at power plant .....	19,000
3. Reinstallation of air preheaters .....	16,000
Total .....	75,000

Failure to include \$40,000 for the transformer vaults in order for the university to furnish AC current to Freedmen's Hospital, while at the same time apparently, including funds for Freedmen's Hospital to change over to AC current, represents a fundamental change in policy. The power plant was constructed at Howard University for the purpose of furnishing heat and electric current to the University and Freedmen's Hospital. This fundamental change in policy will tend to increase the cost of electric current to both consumers.

The disallowance of item for retubing of boiler may require complete shutdown of a boiler and strain of reserve boilers. The Globe Indemnity Co. has again written to the university under date of April 6, 1953, as follows:

Mr. C. G. ELLIOTT,  
Superintendent of Buildings,  
Howard University,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: An accident investigation was made April 2, 1953, at the power plant of No. 3 boiler and it was found that one of waterwall tubes had ruptured. It was noted that several other tubes show signs of bulging.

The chief engineer was informed that this boiler would not be approved for operation, by the writer, until it has been completely retubed.

It is hoped that your No. 2 boiler will be used only as standby unit No. 3 is retubed and will then be retubed also. The tube metal is obviously thinned and fatigued in both of the old boilers.

Respectfully,

J. W. BURCHELL,  
Supervising Engineer.

The item for reinstallation of air preheaters was requested to effect economies of as much as 5 percent in the operating costs of the powerplant. The elimination of this item for \$16,000 means that the plant must continue to operate, at least another year, without the benefit of this important replacement.

The university considers the above two items to be of such mandatory importance that it will be obliged to have the work done even if it must make fur-

ther cuts in personnel in order to effect it.

#### PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS

The committee eliminates the \$30,000 required to complete plans and specifications for the premedical science building.

The committee in its comments on page 8 of the report makes this significant statement:

Including balances carried forward for prior years, a total of \$274,972 is available for the 2 years 1953 and 1954, which the committee believes to be sufficient for any necessary activities of this kind.

This seems to suggest that part of this \$274,842 may be used for the above premedical building plans. It has been my understanding that amounts appropriated for a specific activity can be used for another activity only when enabling legislation is enacted to give authorization. If such legislation is required, then supplemental language will be necessary unless such language can be had before bill H. R. 5246 becomes a law. A far simpler procedure would be to restore this item.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS

The House committee has left out the recommended sum of \$150,000 for an additional turbogenerator in the heat, light, and powerplant. In doing so it makes the following comment:

1. With the thought that any requirements for electrical power that cannot be filled by the present plant should be secured commercially.

The recission of this turbogenerator is almost certain to cause a breakdown in electrical production at the powerplant. The power plant is at the present time overloaded and the electrical service has failed several times during the current year, bringing about a temporary paralysis of light throughout the university—in classrooms, dormitories, libraries, and administrative offices.

The committee is clearly aware, I am sure, that this turbogenerator was recommended in accord with the policy established at the time the powerplant was erected. That power is based upon technical information furnished by two governmental sources showing it would be substantially cheaper for Howard University to produce its own power than to purchase it commercially.

Page 98 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations exhibits in detail expert mechanical and electrical information furnished by Mr. E. W. Goodwin, chief mechanical and electrical engineer. Public buildings service, showing that Howard University can generate power from \$20,828 to \$36.921 cheaper per annum than it can purchase it commercially.

While throwing out the turbogenerator, the committee makes no provisions first, for the installation of the expensive equipment on the Howard University grounds which will be required to be paid for by the university before it can purchase power commercially; and second, the committee makes no provision for the increased annual cost of the power thus to be purchased.

On page 93 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the House committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN] calls attention to the fact that the installation of the high voltage switchgear required to use purchased power commercially from the Potomac Electric Power Co. is more expensive than the additional generating equipment required by the university; and on page 94 he states that the Potomac Electric Power Co. will not stand for the cost of this installation. It must therefore fall upon Howard University. The committee makes no provision for this expensive installation. It, therefore, in fact, estops Howard University from securing increased electrical power at all except by further substantial reduction of at least \$186,291 and possibly more than \$200,000 additional in the funds currently available for instruction in order to provide, first, the cost of the expensive switchgear—a cost greater than the turbogenerator itself; second, and the increased cost of \$36,291 per annum required for the purchase of commercial power.

#### FORBIDS LIFTING OF FREEZE ORDER

Under "Construction of buildings," the committee would seem to be issuing an order which would prevent the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from going forward with the three construction projects which she has recommended and for which she had received the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. Note the following language:

The committee was advised that no funds would be required under the Bureau of the Budget freeze order placed on construction on which a substantial start had not already been made. The committee desires that the Bureau of the Budget not lift this order unless there are compelling reasons for so doing that have not yet been called to the committee's attention.

This language would seem to require a stoppage of the entire building program, except the construction of the dentistry building, which is now under way. If so, this means that the committee is abandoning the entire program for expanding the output of physicians and dentists toward which the Congress has been working for a period of some 5 years. This is clearly a policy change of major significance.

In voting the drastic freeze order on all buildings the committee says:

It is difficult to reason that a continuing expansion of the physical plant is necessary when the enrollment has been substantially decreasing.

The Howard University building program was never intended to accommodate 6,268 students. Its maximum objective was to accommodate 5,200 students, and this only after the medical and dental enrollments had been doubled and the graduate school had grown to be as much as 1,000 students. It must be kept in mind that all of the buildings now authorized were listed as approved objectives in 1929, when they were clearly needed already. It must be kept in mind also that the present enrollment of Howard University is not only much



greater than the enrollment of 1929; it is nearly double the full-time enrollment of 1943. In order to accommodate the present enrollment the university must make use of 13 temporary wooden buildings which are a fire hazard and a danger to life, and must continue to use 15 other deteriorated buildings which the Public Buildings Service had judged unfit for continuing use. Of 42 buildings now on the grounds and actually in use, only 14 of them have the approval of the Public Buildings Service as being fit for continuing and enduring use. Every one of the buildings authorized by the Congress is a present and urgent necessity.

I am not blaming any one particular Member of this House, but somewhere back of all this is someone who is not looking at this with the eyes of a 100-percent American. We had better stop talking about Dixiecrats if this bill goes through and talk about Dixiegops. In the South today no State legislature would make a cut in education, in public health, in money for Negro education, such as you have made today in the Congress of the United States. Beginning with Florida all the way up through all the great universities of the South that are being maintained by southerners for Negro and white education, more money is being appropriated each year. You northerners better look alive. This is a prejudicial bill. You cannot give me one reason why, with an average cut of 4 percent, you pick out 1 Negro university and cut it 54 percent; you pick out 1 Negro hospital that serves not only Washington but all of greater Washington, and cut it 18 percent. Until this question is answered, some of us have opinions that we are not proud to have, but I am forced to have.

I would like to have the chairman of the subcommittee, if he is so disposed, to answer this question. Why is it that you have taken this 1 Negro university and cut its budget 54 percent; you cut it to less than President Eisenhower asked for, you have cut it to less than Mrs. Hobby asked for. The American people deserve an answer.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think the gentleman from New York is deserving of an answer, as long as he raises the question. I am sorry to say I do not recall any testimony in the hearings for a request for a boiler. There was a request in there for a steam distribution system and powerplant. The distribution system amount was \$20,000 and the powerplant was \$150,000. Regardless of the testimony that was given before the committee in regard to the cheapness of generating power by their own powerplant in comparison to buying it from a public utility, the fact still remains that at St. Elizabeths Hospital they discarded the manufacture of their own power and sold the boilers, and they found out it was cheaper to buy the power from a local public utility. If that is true at St. Elizabeths, and that is borne out by the facts, we could not see why it was cheaper for Howard University to generate their own power and spend \$150,000 for a new powerplant.

On the proposition of its being a 54-percent cut for Howard University, that

is not quite a correct statement, because at the time this subcommittee had the hearings for Howard University there was a freeze on by the Bureau of the Budget on construction. That was the reason why we disallowed that, and that being the major portion of the appropriation that the cut was made on, and the testimony also shows that the revised budget had nothing whatever in it for new buildings.

If the gentleman just received that information that he states from Mrs. Hobby within the last 30 minutes as to the agreement between the Health, Education, and Welfare Department and the Bureau of the Budget, he has information that I do not believe any member of this committee has had to date; I am sure I have never heard of it, and if that is true they will probably present that to the Senate subcommittee and the differences will be worked out in conference.

Mr. POWELL. I would like to say to the gentleman two things: First, I have a copy of President Eisenhower's recommendation to the gentleman's committee. This is the mimeographed original. At the bottom of page 5 there is a request for a new boiler, saying that it has been requested by the Globe Indemnity Insurance Co.; that continued operation of these boilers without retubing would cause the insurance company to cancel the policy on Howard University.

Mr. BUSBEY. But they do not take into consideration transferring over to the public utility. If they transfer over to the public utility they are not going to cancel any insurance policy.

Mr. POWELL. I am talking about two things; I am talking about the heating boiler first, failure to repair which will cause canceling insurance on the university, and second, the \$150,000 turbogenerator to produce electric power. It will cost more than \$150,000 to switch over to private power. The Potomac Electric Power Co. will not put in the switchover equipment. It will cost more than \$150,000 to put in a changeover switch to bring in private power—more than the cost of the new turbogenerator. Is this economy Mr. Chairman? If not what does it sound like?

Mr. BUSBEY. If the gentleman is talking about economics, we are looking at it from the viewpoint of the long pull, not the initial cost of installation. I would like to have the gentleman from New York refer to the hearings and show me one word of testimony of Dr. Mordecai Johnson, the president of Howard University, where he requested a single dollar for a new boiler.

Mr. POWELL. Under the items "Salaries and expenses," "(B) for retubing of 1 steam boiler, \$19,000." That is at the bottom of page 1 under the item "Salaries and expenses."

Mr. BUSBEY. Where is it in the hearings?

Mr. POWELL. I do not know about the hearings, but here is the testimony before your committee.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will say to the gentleman from New York that he is able to get hold of information that was never presented to the committee and has not

been before the committee for consideration.

Mr. POWELL. This request was not printed in the hearings?

Mr. BUSBEY. It was never submitted to the committee.

Mr. POWELL. One last thing: The gentleman says it sounds like a lot, a 54-percent cut, but that the cut was taken out under "Construction of new buildings." All right, I grant that but, it is not the whole truth. You cut President Eisenhower's recommendation \$475,000, exclusive of "new construction" which means a cut of almost 20 percent. This still means you cut the only 2 Negro items—Howard University and Freedmen's Hospital—more than any other. Why did you pick on these two Negro institutions?

Mr. BUSBEY. And if the gentleman from New York will refer to page 104, part 1 of the hearings, there is a table there showing how the enrollment of Howard University is going down year after year. The report on the top of page 8 says this: "The estimated gross enrollment for 1953 is only 62 percent of the comparable figure for 1948," and for fiscal 1954 it will be lower than that.

Mr. POWELL. Reread my speech. You took the peak year when Howard University was straining every possible nerve to take care of the GI's. They had more students per instructor than was ideal. But it was their contribution to the postwar period. Will you penalize them for being patriotic?

By your cut, they will have to fire one-third of the faculty. Salaries have gone up. To attract scholars of reputation takes more money. We are trying to create not less brain power but more brain power. What is your aim?

I still insist that our first line of defense is public health, our second line of defense is public education. We are squandering money everywhere else if we do not provide enough for those two lines of defense first.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like for the RECORD to show that since the beginning of this debate I have been attending a meeting of the District Committee and have not been in the House during the entire time. As soon as I finish making this little statement I am going back to the District Committee and will be absent for the balance of the general debate. I make this statement because I have been informed there were some statements made here attributed to me which I did not hear, and, therefore, I can neither confirm nor deny.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I may say to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] that I interpreted any remarks



made regarding him as being very complimentary.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I hope they were, but I have not the slightest idea.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, no appropriations bill comes to this floor without bringing its own particular view of the devoted service of the members of this great committee. The long hours, the detailed study given to the many complex and difficult problems are made light of by the committee—but, Mr. Chairman, as an American I would appear ungrateful indeed if I did not take this opportunity to express in some measure my keen appreciation of the time and energy, the purposefulness and the devotion to duty given so continuously year after year by the members of this great committee.

It must often seem a thankless task, yet there must come moments of deep satisfaction as you strive to do all possible to oil the machinery of representative government and keep it in order.

It is probable, Mr. Chairman, that there has never been a more difficult task given any appropriations committee than that facing you this year. Keenly alive to the cold background of watchful waiting on the part of the Communist world in the hope that we shall destroy ourselves economically, your committee is given the task of bringing our national expenditures more nearly in balance with national receipts. Yet not one of you but wants to assure the continuance of such programs as are of definite benefit to the people of this great country of ours and which are legitimately within the Federal field.

Probably no subcommittee task is more difficult than that having the responsibility of appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. So many of the items in the bills deal directly with the human element, almost with the very lives of our people. May I take this opportunity to say with great sincerity that we are especially grateful to you today, Mr. BUSBY, for what I am sure has been a heartfelt consideration of these important measures. That we attempt to plead the cause of some phase of one or of both bills where we feel too deep cuts have been made into the very life of an institution or a service is in line with our democratic institutions.

As a long-time Member of this body, I thank you for the time you give even while I regret that I cannot always agree with your conclusions.

Mr. Chairman, on page 9 of the bill, lines 6, 7, 8, and 9, the Congress is informed that the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor is to receive \$300,000. On page 5 of the report, 2 lines inform us that this is \$60,000 less than the request made by the Bureau.

I have asked for this time, Mr. Chairman, in order to give to the Members at least some picture of this Bureau and of the work it does.

The Women's Bureau was authorized by an act of Congress on June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16) to "promote the welfare of wage earning women, improve their working conditions, increase their

efficiency, and advance their opportunities for profitable employment.

The Women's Bureau is the smallest of all Government operations. It started in 1920 and has continued a small department ever since. As was said by the distinguished Member, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] it represents 20 million working women, I believe, which is 30 percent of the women workers of the country. It is the only place where women can go for advice, for help, for information, for a sympathetic hearing and adequate understanding. The Wage and Hour Division has so much more than just the problems of women to consider. At one time there was a staff of some 80 people. In 1944 the peak of its staff was 77. By 1951 it was down to 72 and in the following 2 years, since 1951, it lost 14 more positions, so today the staff is 58. About half of them are trained, professional workers and work very efficiently in the closest cooperation with other bureaus of the Labor Department. They do this in order to widen the women's opportunities to work under suitable conditions and for fair wages.

The requested budget for 1954 was the huge sum of \$360,000—thousands, Mr. Chairman, not millions. It has been cut by the committee some 17 percent reducing it to \$300,000. Nearly all the reduction will have to be made in staff which would mean that about 10 of these 58 jobs would have to be vacated. For the past 2 years the Bureau has met its budgetary losses by gradually shrinking all the aspects of its work. This time the cuts must come in personnel. Now there comes a time, Mr. Chairman, when you cannot shrink any longer and continue with any kind of efficiency. In a way, you can hardly continue at all, because you cannot do a job.

Mr. Chairman, one-third of the labor force of the United States is made up of women. They are not incidental nor transient participants in the work of this country. They work in all the occupational classifications of the Census Records. Some of them work as young girls just out of school. Over one-half of those who work are married and living with their families. Over 5 million are the mothers of children under 18, who have to work. Over 2 million of these are mothers of children under 6. These again have to work. Women are the backbone of some of the essential professional groups, like nurses and teachers. They are the bulk of the clerical workers. They do practically all of the paid housework in the country, and they are approximately one-fifth of the operatives of production industry. They are, in short, a very essential part of the economic help in this country.

At the same time they are faced with problems peculiar to them as women. They must and desire to maintain their homes and take care of their families even while they work on their jobs. In 1 family in 10 a woman is the head of a family. Women workers still face a variety of discriminations on the job. For hiring purposes they are considered "old" at 35. For training purposes they

are frequently discouraged from following a natural bent, because there is not likely to be an opening for youth. In 1950 the average earnings of women from wages and salaries were overall 45 percent of the average earnings of men.

The welfare of wage-earning women means that women, their employers, men wage-earners, legislators, the press, and the public must understand their problems and deal with them on the basis of a recognition of what is involved. The program of the Women's Bureau is devised with the purpose in view of providing the tools of such understanding. It seeks to provide for these tools in terms laid out in the legislation which established the Bureau by providing information and recommending standards and policies to improve their working conditions, increase their efficiency, advance their opportunities for profitable employment.

The bill proposes a 17 percent cut.

I want to emphasize what I glossed over a moment ago, the fact that women who work are not through their work when they go home. They still have their homes to maintain. They still must put the children to bed after giving them their supper. They still must houseclean now and again. They still have a husband to feed, if they are fortunate. If they are not, maybe their mother, their sister, their aunt lives with them. Perhaps she is the one who takes care of the child while the woman goes out and earns enough to keep the family together. All these things are of great importance and they need to be understood.

The Women's Bureau serves our wonderful American women well with never-ending zeal and with rare efficiency. In addition, Mr. Chairman, our Women's Bureau is a clearinghouse for women everywhere. It is like a golden thread of hope, of friendship, of understanding across the world. Let me give you just one little taste of the far-reaching influence it has:

Recently, when Japan gave the suffrage to women, a small group of women was sent to this country. They went to the Women's Bureau. They learned there how to organize their little groups, how to learn how to vote, what it was to vote, what it meant. There was no other place for them in the whole world to go.

What has happened to them since? They have all gone back. Quite recently an American woman was up in the very northernmost part of Japan. There she found one of these women going from house to house, the little far-removed farms, where nobody goes but a Communist—and they go constantly. She found this woman eagerly waiting for mail from the Women's Bureau in Washington to answer some important questions for her. Happily she said: "The Bureau always knows how to help me."

That is not a small thing to do, Mr. Chairman, that is a very great thing to do, and it is being done in many countries of the world as women try to find their way into broader responsibilities. They need to know how to help build



a world where, when they have to work, they can work without danger, at reasonable hours, where they can be adequately paid. No, Mr. Chairman, these world contacts made by the Women's Bureau are of more value than can be measured. Hope, friendship, encouragement. Is that not something very concrete, very real, very wonderful, to inject into the gathering darkness of the world? And at such little cost.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is my intention tomorrow to offer an amendment that will restore the amount to the sum requested in President Eisenhower's budget, which will make it possible for the Women's Bureau to continue doing the work it has been doing for women. Surely this is little enough to ask, Mr. Chairman, in an era when figures come mostly in millions and billions, for the work of a bureau to which women can go for help, advice, and instruction, for hope and for courage.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to take this opportunity as one who has served for 4 years on this particular subcommittee when it was the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency appropriations subcommittee, and one who has inspected over those 4 years the budget requests and the operations of the Women's Bureau, that I thoroughly agree with every single word that the gentlewoman has said here this afternoon. I shall lend my support to the amendment which will restore this unwarranted cut, a cut which cannot be explained.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman. I want to say in closing that it is difficult for me to go against the action of this committee. I should like to feel that it was taken upon inadequate testimony. I shall hope that the picture as I have painted it in these short moments will have given a broader aspect of the situation which will have brought with it the conviction that the small sum should and must be restored.

It is a small sum, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, but it will mean very much to women and children—more than anyone can know.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do this in order to pay my respects to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] who has just finished speaking and making her usual eloquent plea for one of the services in which she is tremendously interested. I know of no individual in the entire United States who has given as much time, money, and talents over many years for programs for the benefit of women and children, and nursing, and many other worthwhile endeavors. I cannot entirely agree with her, however, that the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor is the only place that women can go for help and protection of their interests. I think it is a wonderful thing that they do have a special bureau known as the Women's Bureau. I am sure every member of the

committee agrees with her wholeheartedly on that point. But the Wage and Hour Division administers the minimum wage laws for women, the same as for men. The Bureau of Labor Standards provides for the welfare of women, the same as it does for men, and many of the other regular agencies of Government do provide various services for women. But, nevertheless, I wholeheartedly subscribe to most of what she says. The women should have the Women's Bureau.

In regard to the cut. The so-called Truman budget was for \$360,000. The so-called Eisenhower budget was for \$350,000. In cutting the \$50,000 from the Eisenhower budget, the committee did not intend to hinder the work of this bureau in any way. I think that the women are as patriotic as any other group in this country. They have always been in the forefront in their willingness to sacrifice for the Nation's good. I am frank to admit, as chairman of this Subcommittee of Labor—Health, Education, and Welfare, it will be very difficult for me tomorrow to oppose an amendment to restore these cuts of \$50,000 or \$60,000 in view of the fact that yesterday we added \$50 million, above the Eisenhower budget, to the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. May I thank the gentleman. I was about to say it was a very difficult moment for all of us to accept a small cut like that when the addition has been made to the appropriation yesterday.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I wanted to question the correctness of one statement the gentleman made with regard to the gentlewoman from Ohio who just left the floor, in which he stated that she had done service in this work for so many, many years. I wondered how he arrived at that conclusion.

Mr. BUSBEY. Because ever since my first term in Congress, which was the Seventy-eighth Congress, I have heard her on this floor many, many times fight for these principles and ideals in which she believes and about which she knows so much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

(Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I have a deep concern for the appropriation bill which is before us today because I am convinced that the health of the American people will be best protected and best served by vigorous research into the causes and cures of the major diseases. The Federal Government in providing funds for research in these fields is doing a service for the people of this country that is not done in any other country in the world. The efforts we are making as a nation along these lines are trail blazing and if we maintain them, will

keep for us the eminence we enjoy today among the nations of the world.

The requirements in the field of mental health particularly arrested my attention as I read the hearings on the bill before us today. One of the foremost mental doctors in the country made a stirring plea for additional funds and summed up the situation very well. In his testimony he said that last year the Federal Government appropriated \$10,819,000 for work in mental health, the most substantial part of which was to be devoted to basic research. He made a plea to increase that figure this year to \$28 million of which \$8 million was to be devoted to the construction of laboratories and research facilities. He went on to remark:

We can confidently expect that Federal funds will provide the impetus for further basic research which in time can lead to more effective application of research to the ill patient. This impetus through adequate funds could do this by, (1) providing opportunities for more trained and skilled research workers to enter this field and for project grants; (2) through the provision of adequate facilities in the form of building and equipment.

I regret that the committee has found it necessary to strike from the request of this doctor and his colleagues all the funds for construction. It is only logical that medical men and medical machines can do a job if they are contained in a building which is adequate to house them. The problem is really as simple as that. It may be that next year we can meet this need more responsively. I certainly hope so because I am convinced that until we do, the total research effort will be seriously retarded. I am pleased though that the bill shows an appropriation for mental health for fiscal year 1954 of \$10,895,000. This means that the research projects that are going on during the current fiscal year will be able to continue throughout the coming year; and 1 or 2 new ones will be inaugurated. With more than 8,000,000 people in the United States suffering from some form of mental illness, losing more than \$3 billion in productivity, we can easily justify an outlay of \$28 million to cure the situation. I am gratified, however, that even though the request of the medical men was not met in its entirety, we have moved a little bit forward over last year and it is my profound hope that in the years to come we will continue to accelerate the rate of this progress.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct a few remarks to the subject of rehabilitation.

It was my pleasure to be in the Congress that amended the Rehabilitation Act in 1943, which for many disabled people, and especially those suffering from blindness, could be called their bill of rights. This Congress has been called upon to appropriate funds to assist the States in training the blind and other severely disabled to fit into many types of productive employment. It is rather unique to note that both the former Democratic administration and the present Republican administration, in view of the needs of this group of less fortunate citizens, have, after due considera-



tion, arrived at the same recommended figure of \$23 million.

I am sure that all of you will agree with me that it is indeed better business to meet this request from the administration and prepare these disabled persons for satisfactory employment rather than to provide, through other programs, the financial assistance which they will call for if they are unable to receive the necessary counseling and training which will render them employable.

I would like to point out that during the last fiscal year the rehabilitation services in many States trained and placed into remunerative employment approximately 3,700 blind individuals alone.

I further believe that I am safe in saying that had not this number been trained for employment through the rehabilitation services they would certainly have applied—and rightly so—for aid to the needy blind under provisions of the Social Security Act. Now, if 50 percent of the 3,700 rehabilitated applied for aid to the blind, that would mean 1,750 persons asking for assistance. The national average is approximately \$53 per month per individual. This figure alone would run well over \$1 million a year, and it would not only be for 1 year. For every day a blind person is idle, it becomes harder to train that person for employment. Certainly he would have the prospect of many years of idleness with this payment increasing year by year, while with the figure recommended by the administration these blind persons could no doubt be placed into employment with a training cost of not more than \$500 per person. They would then be taxpayers and we are aware of the fact that the average repayment in Federal taxes by one of these rehabilitated individuals over his working years will run well above 10 times the amount spent on his rehabilitation.

We now have more than 20,000 blind persons gainfully employed in this country. Many more are undergoing training at this time, and still others are anxiously waiting for the time to begin their training. I ask you then, are we going to economize at the expense of these less fortunate individuals or shall we support the recommendations of the administration, and as I said before, the recommendations of the previous administration, and go along with the figures which were set by the people actually rendering this service in the field. I come from a district that is heavily populated with blind workers. I myself wish to go on record in support of every penny possible to assist in rehabilitating the blind. I do not wish to economize at the expense of a program which would train more of these blind people to become gainfully employed.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

(Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, in the bill before us today we are being asked to continue our partnership with the scientific skill and brains of this Nation

in the effort to solve baffling diseases which are the principal causes of death and disability today.

This bill includes \$61,586,200, in total, for the National Institutes of Health. This is a reduction of \$23,413,800 from the original request, but \$2,555,450 over the appropriations for 1953 and \$5,246,200 over the revised budget presented to the committee by the Secretary on April 14, 1953.

The funds requested for the National Institutes of Health of the Public Health Service are requested because our doctors and laboratory workers are engaged in running down leads in these fields of disease which give great promise and great hope of solution. In effect, these scientists have come to us and said: "Given the time and facilities to continue our work, we can one day do away entirely with the grievous ills that bring about prolonged suffering and untimely death." We are asked to provide a relatively small sum to enable these men to continue their work because there is no other way in which it can be continued. The Congress has recognized this fact in authorizing by law the establishment of the Institutes of Health. We are now requested to provide funds for the work of these Institutes to continue, and if we measure the accomplishments of the scientists in these Institutes, we cannot fail to realize that they must have at least the sums of money approved by the committee which heard their testimony.

It is very heartening to listen to these men of science and to realize that in a world threatened with potential atomic war, with great emphasis on the development of means of destruction and annihilation, that along with it is going the effort to extend the span of life and to eradicate the suffering that is caused by the major diseases.

The men who do this work in the scientific fields are modest men whose accomplishments for the most part are unsung. This is probably due to the fact that research is such a painstaking and slow process, and the results measured day by day are so small. It is only when the results of years of difficult and coordinated effort come to a dramatic conclusion that we arrive at a full appreciation of the achievements of the scientific workers. It is only when a discovery such as penicillin is made that we recognize the deep and far-reaching effect on the Nation's well-being which is made by these men. They have come to us and asked us for funds to continue their work. The very least we can do is to provide those funds on a scale that will enable them to continue.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE], a member of the committee.

(Mr. BUDGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I had thought the committee was somewhat more in agreement than has been expressed by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. I am very pleased, however, to find that he and I are in complete agreement as to the rela-

tive merits and demerits of Mrs. Hobby and Mr. Ewing. Perhaps on that score we should let the report of the committee speak for itself wherein it is said, at page 17 of the report:

The committee is convinced that the new Secretary will not require an increase in funds to do a much better job than did her predecessor.

I feel that this bill, as has been stated by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is an extremely difficult bill for anyone to oppose. A great many of the amounts in the bill should be increased. With me it is only a question of what is the most important duty which I have as a Member of the Congress of the United States. When we go down through the list of items in this bill, practically every one of them relates to human sufferings which confront our people. All of us would love to see the items increased so that we could stamp out all of the sufferings with which the human race is confronted, particularly those which are physical and financial. However, I feel, as a Member of this great body, that I have a duty over and beyond that of providing, insofar as we are able, the funds to alleviate those sufferings. I feel that my greatest obligation to my country is to place it upon a fiscal policy where we can preserve for coming generations of this Nation the wonderful heritage under which we have been privileged to live, the Constitution of the United States.

I voted a few weeks back to cut appropriations for the Department of the Interior not 20 percent, as the gentleman from Rhode Island says the Department of Labor has been cut below the Truman budget, but I, coming from a western State where the Department of the Interior functions in all its programs, supported the bill which cut that Department 33⅓ percent. I supported the cuts for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments which went substantially further than the cuts here made against the Department of Labor.

Yesterday, although I come from a farming district, I voted to reduce by \$55 million funds paid to the farmers. Today I appear here in support of this bill with the thought that in consistency there must be some virtue.

I dislike the cuts which have been made in this bill, probably more than any which I have previously supported, but I do feel that unless the budget is balanced and unless the taxpayers of the United States are given some relief this Nation faces collapse. In all other respects I find myself in total agreement with the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Going further in that connection I wish to agree with the remarks made by the gentleman from Iowa a few moments ago when he said that the big appropriation bills and particularly the foreign-aid bill should be presented to the Congress before these bills dealing with the needs of our own people are considered.

In case members of the committee may have overlooked it I would like to read into the RECORD an article written by the Associated Press which appeared in the Washington Star last evening under



a United Nations, New York, dateline, May 20:

Ex-Secretary General Trygve Lie received \$20,000 terminal pay from the United Nations in a final settlement ending his 7 years with the U. N. officials said yesterday.

Dag Hammarskold, Mr. Lie's successor, authorized the payment. Mr. Lie did not take part in the staff pension fund, but the UN Assembly decided when he was hired in 1946 that he would be granted a pension of \$10,000 a year for life. This will take effect July 10.

During his time as Secretary-General Mr. Lie drew \$20,000 per year salary, plus \$20,000 expenses for entertainment. He also received the use of the mansion in Forest Hills complete with staff, and was furnished a car with a chauffeur.

And yet here we are talking about items that affect Americans in their very well-being, and we give a man as secretary of the United Nations \$40,000 a year in tax-free money on which he pays no taxes, then give him \$20,000 severance pay, and on top of that we are going to pay him \$10,000 a year, tax-free, as long as he lives even though he did not contribute to the pension fund. I sincerely hope this Congress can see fit to examine completely the fiscal affairs of the United Nations and particularly the fiscal affairs as they have been conducted outside these United States. I for one pray to God—and I know all my colleagues in this body join me—that we will have the wisdom and the courage in this session of Congress to bring our fiscal affairs into such balance that we may guarantee to the future generations the marvelous advantages under which we have been privileged to live our lives in the greatest Nation in history.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I want to commend the gentleman for his stand on economy on all of the appropriation bills that have been proposed and I also want to commend him for the fine cooperation he gave so far as the National Institutes of Health appropriations are concerned.

Mr. BUDGE. I thank the gentleman. I know how interested he has been in the National Institute program since its inception. The current success of the program is in large measure due to the untiring efforts of the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. Chairman, there are many items which should be increased as we go down through this bill and which could be if the peoples' substance had not been squandered elsewhere. For example, there is the National Institutes of Health item. They are seven separate institutes which are trying to find the answer as to why people suffer from these crippling, horrible infirmities which assail the human body. I join the gentleman from Rhode Island as does every Member of this body in the wish that we could in some way provide sufficient funds so that the answers may be found to these various problems. But I reiterate, we have to go one step further and be mighty, mighty sure that we do not completely destroy the basic economic structure upon which this Nation has been built.

The policy of the past 20 years has been to spend and waste here and abroad with no thought toward the ultimate and obvious result; the bankruptcy and destruction of the Republic. To that policy I cannot subscribe.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

(Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I am for cuts that result in economy, but I am against cuts in the bloodstream of our Nation; therefore I am happy to rise at this moment in support of the very sound views so splendidly stated on the floor here today by our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

#### SO THIS IS ECONOMY

Mr. Chairman, I am for cuts for economy, but I am against cuts in the bloodstream of the Nation. That is why I am happy to take this time to heartily endorse the very sound views so splendidly expounded here today by our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Given a citizenry healthy in mind and body, our country can withstand any and all onslaughts from within or without, whether ideological or physical.

Destroy or impair our educational and health facilities and you destroy or impair our capacity to withstand evil and to improve our civilization.

The cuts in this bill of over \$65 million for health and hospital services, and over \$20 million for education are unpardonable. They will wreak untold and irreparable harm. You can postpone many things but you cannot postpone treatment of the ill, rehabilitation of the maimed, or education of the young. The time lost in doing those things can never be regained. The damage can never be repaired.

A country that appropriates billions for atomic weapons of destruction will never retain the respect of a free world if it reduces by over \$23 million, as proposed in this bill, the appropriations for cancer, mental health, heart, dental, arthritis, blindness, and similar research. I have many times in this session pointed out how this administration is pushing up the cost of every necessity of life of the wage earner. By this bill the Congress will now take away over \$42 million that the Labor Department needs to help labor earn a livelihood.

I urge my colleagues to support the Fogarty amendments when they are offered.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks previously made by Members complimenting the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island upon his fine presentation here today. I should like

to add also that the chairman of Oklahoma's congressional delegation has already placed in the RECORD copies of messages from outstanding Oklahoma leaders in the field of vocational education and vocational rehabilitation, commenting upon the unfortunate effect on these vital programs of the budget cuts proposed by this committee.

I am in wholehearted agreement with our delegation chairman in his protest against these particular cuts.

I deplore the proposal to discontinue support of land-grant colleges by endowment. This is certain to injure Oklahoma's great A. & M. College, which is so important to our State's agricultural and industrial progress, along with other great universities and colleges.

I deplore the cuts in programs vital to public health and to labor, as well as to education, and find it impossible to reconcile these cuts with the specific campaign commitments of both major parties.

I would very much prefer to see drastic cuts and economy in our programs for aid to foreign countries, before voting for these cuts in programs at home so vital to our national well-being.

It is unfortunate that we will not have the opportunity to review and vote on these foreign expenditures, before passing on budgets for programs at home.

I think a special protest is also in order, before concluding, against the proposed cut of more than 50 percent in budget estimates for Howard University. I doubt if there is another university or college in America which is being cut so drastically in its budget, in these times of rising salaries and institutional costs. Surely this cannot be justified on the sole basis of comparative enrollment in 1953 and 1948, because practically every coeducational college in our country will show enrollment decline during this period.

It is my hope that all Members will think carefully of the great importance of education, health, and vocational rehabilitation, to the enduring strength of our country, before accepting the proposed committee reductions.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has given the Committee a comprehensive statement and it would be presumptuous for me to dwell upon some of the items in which I am particularly interested. I have previously spoken of my appreciation for the significant service being rendered by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Its important work is of a scientific and professional character and by reason of its nonpartisan approach has developed great prestige throughout the country. I am sure that the objective character of its studies is universally recognized. The cut in the budget request for the Bureau which the gentleman from Rhode Island mentioned will curtail and perhaps eliminate some vital services which had been anticipated during the next fiscal period. I refer to the revisions in procedures pertaining to



gathering of figures on housing starts and also the resuming of certain surveys of family expenditures to keep a constant check on the Consumer Price Index.

Undoubtedly, a cut of \$689,000 from the budget request will have an impact upon the current activities of the Bureau. The Bureau of Labor Statistics figures will be extremely important in case there is a turn in the business situation, and American business will suffer from lack of reliable figures, not just those constituting the Consumer Price Index but also those having to do with housing, employment, wages, and productivity.

I mention the Consumer Price Index because of its great importance to business groups. I do not intend to offer an amendment restoring the cut, but I trust before the debate is concluded the committee members can enlighten us further regarding these items.

I wish also to mention the severe cut in the apprentice training program since I happen to be somewhat familiar with this activity—incidentally, one of the oldest activities in the Department of Labor. About 19 years ago I served for a while as a member of a committee in the State of Arkansas which directed some of the operations and I became acquainted at that time with W. F. Patterson, the director, who continues in this important post. Under his able direction a splendid program has been maintained and I have never heard a word of criticism of this program upon which so many employers rely and in which leading businessmen have participated. This program was one of the highly successful programs of readjustment to civilian life of World War II veterans. It was based on the principle that employers and employees can do the training job themselves. As I understand it, there is no element of subsidy to industry in connection with this activity. I am advised that the present systems cover the employment of more than 155,000 apprentices. This is a program that cannot be handled by the States separately, for some coordination and national advisory service is imperative if requirements of American industry, particularly in a period of defense activities, are to be met. For these reasons I trust that the committee will consider restoring at least a portion if not all of the cut in the budget request.

Still another item so well presented by the gentleman from Rhode Island is that for the vocational rehabilitation service which suffered a cut of \$2,400,000. Again this is a program that has proved its value. It is no longer a theoretical matter, since thousands of handicapped workers have graduated into positions requiring training. One survey which came to my attention some time ago showed that the efficiency record of a given group of these trainees exceeded those of the nonhandicapped employees. Finally, I wish to subscribe to the statements heretofore made with reference to the elimination of the appropriations for the land grant colleges under the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935.

In case of the University of Arkansas this item amounts to \$38,000 under a cooperative program which has nationwide support. The General Assembly of our State has adjourned and funds are not available to replace Federal funds which the university authorities had every right to anticipate.

I appreciate the opportunity of offering these comments in support of the position which the gentleman from Rhode Island has presented. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the work of the subcommittee. It is only because of my conviction that the cuts in these cases will handicap the Federal service and will not achieve economy that I make these remarks with reference to the bill.

(Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WATTS].

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with my other colleagues in commending the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for his fine presentation of the effects of the cuts recommended by the committee. I think it is regrettable that these cuts have been recommended, as I feel that they will seriously affect the very fundamental things that have made this the greatest country on earth, namely, the educated ability and health of our people to fully and wisely develop our natural resources. The proposed cuts strike directly at the education and health of our people. While I favor economy, we should do everything in our power to provide the necessary educational and health facilities and to encourage our people to secure the best education and have the best health possible. The recommended cuts affecting vocational education and our land-grant colleges under the Bankhead-Jones Act and such other cuts as affect the health, welfare, and education of our people are very unfortunate, and it is my intention to join with other Members in the House in attempting to restore these funds when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a telegram from the very noted educator, Mr. James J. McCain, president of Kansas State College. In this telegram he informs me that the usual biennial appropriation of \$78,000 for this institution has been withheld from the appropriations. He states that this sum is urgently needed to carry on the necessary work of the college, that the Legislature of the State of Kansas has adjourned, and for this reason the sum cannot be replaced from that source.

Kansas State College is an institution of national importance with several thousand students from every part of the Nation. It seems to me that it is poor business on the part of the National Government to seek to economize at the expense of our schools. I submit the tele-

gram from President McCain to be included in the RECORD:

MANHATTAN, KANS., May 19, 1953.  
Representative HOWARD MILLER,  
Washington, D. C.:

House Appropriations Committee in reporting appropriation bill, Department Health, Education, and Welfare recommends complete elimination grants resident teaching land-grant colleges under Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935. Full amount of cut \$2,501,000. Kansas State reduction \$39,000 each year of coming biennium, or total of \$78,000. Kansas State and most other colleges cannot make up cuts since legislatures have adjourned. Understand bill reaches floor of House Friday. Will appreciate your supporting restoration of full amount. Congressman CLIFFORD HOPE familiar with details.  
Kindest regards.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, it is always a pleasure to listen to our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] present the matters involved in this bill; in fact, I know that this whole subcommittee, including its chairman and the other members on that committee, have worked long and untiringly to bring a fair bill to the House, and at the same time effect economies.

Mr. Chairman, however, I must agree that many of the actions taken, in my opinion, have missed the mark, and I expect to support the ranking minority Member the gentleman from Rhode Island, JOHN FOGARTY. I find in the years I have been here that I can agree and usually do agree with him, and I know that the whole membership was pleased to hear the very fine explanation which he gave. I think that a majority are going to agree with his viewpoint. Certainly, the vocational rehabilitation program, the hospital construction program and other items which the committee has reduced are sound programs. Adequate funds for such programs should be put ahead of many things in Government. Mr. FOGARTY plans to offer amendments restoring funds to both and I shall support him. Also there are several other items in which he is interested, but which some of the rest of us have agreed to present to the House. I am glad to say that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], one of the soundest men, I think, in this body and one of the best informed men on educational matters, expects to offer an amendment restoring the reduction in the appropriation for vocational agriculture. Unless some one else should do so I expect to offer an amendment restoring the item for the land-grant college. I know we are all in favor of economy, but the question is, What is real economy? For real economy the action taken must be for real economy and if the program affected is sound and desired, we must have some reasonable plan for the continuance of the program. In my judgment the committee has no such plan either for vocational agriculture or the land-grant colleges. Practically every State in the Union participates in these programs. Practically every State depends upon these funds as a part of the school bud-



get to handle or to take care of the faculty and the teachers and the teaching costs in those programs. Now to say that we are going to save the people tax money by cutting it out here and letting them pay it through the State does not necessarily save any money because nobody attempts to say that these programs are not good.

Now if the States can do a better job or a more economical job, well and good but the people foot the bill and just simply to let the same people support the same program by their taxes through the State instead of the Federal does not necessarily mean any saving at all.

Actually, here, while the committee says let the States handle the programs, no such arrangements have been made. Nobody attempts to say this money is not necessary to run the program. All agree they are sound, good programs. We merely say we are going to cut it out here and let the States pay it; and if all the States are participants, it is hard for me to see that you save any money there. But what do you do?

We had this same kind of approach requested by the Budget Bureau in our agricultural appropriations bill. It was recommended that we simply eliminate all quarantine on the Japanese beetles. It was recommended that we should cut all of the nurseries operated by the Soil Conservation Service, eliminate quarantines and programs on potato weevils, and on Hall scale and other diseases, and let the States do the job. But there have been no arrangements for these States to take the job over. There were no funds in the budgets of the States to take over. There had been no understanding with the States as to what was going to happen.

Further investigation showed that with regard to my State the legislature will not meet until next January, and funds could not be available for 15 months. And the legislature, so I understand, will not meet in Minnesota until the year after next, and thus it was with practically all of the States. To come in here appropriationwise and say, "Let's cut the money out and let the States pick it up," when it is apparent most of them cannot do it, is merely to abolish to a degree the program where it is apparent that actually the States cannot take over right now. It is false economy. All you are doing is upsetting the operations of a very fine work.

In the Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College in my State, which is a Negro training school, these funds constitute a large part of the support for the faculty. We are making a decided effort to strengthen Negro education in the State but this would retard the program. The same situation exists elsewhere. The same thing affects all land-grant colleges. In agricultural vocational training these funds mean much to the schools all over the United States.

If this this be a proper approach, to push everything back on the States, and I doubt that, but if that be what you are going to do, have you saved any money if they are going to have to pay for it through a program run by the States rather than by the Federal Government?

If that is a saving, is it a sound approach to just cut it out here and let the States pick it up, when you know most of those legislatures will not meet for 1 year or 2 years, and they will have no chance to pick up the slack? That is what you do when you say you are going to make this reduction regardless. Let us make reductions on a sound basis and with regard to sound programs, arrange for their continuance first. If we are going to save money, let us save it in a way where we are not eliminating a very valuable and actually a necessary work.

I noted that it was stated a moment ago that yesterday we passed the agricultural appropriation bill, and I believe the statement was that we had increased it by \$50 million. The truth of the matter is that the bill was \$37 million below the Truman budget, and it was \$24 million below this year's expenditures. Certainly that is no increase. Except for flood prevention and research there were no increases over Mr. Benson's budget in appropriations. There were increases in loan authorizations, which are dependent upon how the Department is run during the coming year. Those increases were part of programs which I think have lasting benefit; nevertheless, there was no increase in appropriations in that bill, but a reduction of \$24 million from the present year.

What that has to do with the bill before us, I do not know, except that there and here we should let each program stand on its own merits, and if it is good and we wish it continued, do not cut it out until you have arranged for others to take over.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to bring to the attention of the House matters that I feel are of considerable interest. I should like to say that I intend to support the committee on this bill. I think they have done an excellent job. I recognize the very persuasive arguments the gentleman from Rhode Island has made. I also recognize the great contributions he has made to public health in the past.

I am glad that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has raised some of the questions he has as to the participation of the States, for that is one of the subjects I would like to address to the Committee today. In doing so, I may be stepping into some difficulties in my own State. I received a letter the other day which I suppose all members of the Ohio delegation received, which was sent to me by a Mrs. Arneson, Washington representative of Spokesmen for Children. She sent me a copy of a letter she had received from Dr. John D. Porterfield, the director of health of the State of Ohio. I read the letter carefully because it had to do with child aid, children's health, and crippled children. I think we must take care of the children who have been afflicted. But, I was surprised when I read Dr. Porterfield's letter because, let me say

to the members of the committee, the State of Ohio has no debt and has a great surplus. They are in much better position than the Federal Government. Dr. Porterfield says this, and I should like to read his letter:

STATE OF OHIO,  
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
Columbus, Ohio, March 12, 1953.  
MRS. KATHALEEN C. ARNESON,  
Washington Representative,  
Spokesmen for Children,  
Arlington, Va.

DEAR MRS. ARNESON: I am in receipt of your letter of February 27, which is concerned with the impending reduction in Federal grants-in-aid to the States as indicated in the President's budget.

Ohio's share of maternal and child health grant-in-aid funds is not sufficient to carry on the scope and quality of program we would like to see realized. Our State legislature has never appropriated funds to support the maternal and child-health program, and thus we rely entirely on Federal assistance.

In the main there are two broad categories which would be affected by a reduction in Federal funds, namely: (1) Less money for distribution to local health departments throughout the State, and (2) a reduction in consultative and demonstration services. This means that local health departments will have less financial assistance from the State to supplement their undernourished budgets. Of necessity such activities as well as child conferences, immunization programs, school health activities, otological diagnostic clinics, etc., would have to function on a lesser scale. From the standpoint of the State health department an expansion of the nutrition, hearing, and vision programs would not be possible and the addition of such vital persons as a pediatrician and more hospital nursing consultants to the maternal and child health staff would be out of the question. I need not dwell on what benefits would be derived from the addition of such key staff to the State as a whole.

If sufficient grant-in-aid moneys were received, this department would be in a position to not only supplement the present staff but to provide sums of money for payments to hospitals for care of premature infants of medically indigent parents and also make payments for medical and surgical care for needy children who had been examined at our State-sponsored otological diagnostic clinics.

I realize this is a rather sketchy presentation of some of the needs which could be met if additional Federal funds were available. I sincerely hope this information will be useful to you.

Sincerely yours,  
JOHN D. PORTERFIELD, M. D.,  
Director of Health.

Mr. Chairman, that comes from a State with a great surplus and no debt. They are now turning to the Federal Government and saying that we must increase these appropriations because without appropriations from the Federal Government, we will have no program in the State of Ohio for children's health, welfare, and the crippled children. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, it is time to serve notice on the States that are in a position to handle these matters themselves, that they had better start to appropriate some funds. We can balance the Federal budget and reduce taxes if the State will accept their responsibilities and take care of these programs which the States can handle



more efficiently and inexpensively themselves.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. That was not the attitude of you folks over in Ohio when you wanted some assistance for impacted school districts. They were over here and got hundreds of thousands of dollars to assist them.

Mr. BOW. That may be true, but I will say to the gentleman—this is my position, and I say to my State I believe it is time the States accept their responsibility. There are many on your side of the aisle, sir, as well as on mine who will agree with me and are firm believers in States' rights. I believe it is a two-way highway. If we are to have States' rights, we are to have State responsibilities, and this is one place we should accept our responsibilities.

Mr. BAILEY. At least they should be consistent.

Mr. BOW. I am sorry I do not yield further to the gentleman. We should be consistent. Let me raise a question on the point of consistency. I do not see my friend, BILLY MATTHEWS, for whom I have a great regard, but just the other day we passed the tidelands bill to give back to the States that control. Those who believe in States' rights and State control of tidelands should also believe in States' rights and responsibilities in other fields. I think there should be consistency. There has to be a two-way street. I believe that where the States can do these things, they can do them more economically and can reduce the burden of taxation because if we tax the people in Ohio and take the tax dollar from their pockets and distribute them through the bureaus here in Washington, and then back to the States, each place that that dollar stops, takes its particular part of that dollar away, and when it goes back to Ohio, you do not have the kind of dollar that has been taken out of the taxpayers' pockets. If we keep it in Ohio and run our own affairs, we will have a sound dollar in Ohio, which has not been clipped by the various bureaus as it goes on its way to the various States.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss the question of vocational training in the schools. I am a firm believer in vocational training. I have supported the program and will continue to support it. I received many telegrams urging me to vote for the increase. I regret to say I will not follow the demands that have been made upon me for that, and I will support the committee. What has happened? On the subject of vocational training, there again is something which the States can participate in. If the cut of the committee is adopted, and if my figures are right, which I have received from the committee, it will amount to a reduction of just a little bit over \$1 a year for each student now in the vocational training in the schools—\$1.

I am convinced that in the programs they can find some way, within a period of 1 year, to absorb \$1. That is what this cut amounts to.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to say, since the telegrams have started rolling in to Washington, I have discussed this problem with some of the men in the various States who have the responsibility of administering this vocational education program; and in discussing it with them, while they say, "Surely, it will hurt us to some extent. We believe you are right in making the States assume their responsibility, and we will get along somehow."

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman. As I say, I believe they can find some way of taking care of that \$1 for each student.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee this morning discussed briefly a question which I have raised with the Department of Education. That is the question of communistic propaganda that is being circulated in the schools of the United States. A distinguished superintendent of schools in my district called to my attention a pamphlet that is being mailed out of Washington by the Hungarian Legation, sent to the libraries of every high school in the United States. I spoke on the matter in the House on April 30, 1953, and my remarks appear on page 4414 of the RECORD, outlining the language and the type of propaganda that is being circulated into the schools. I have asked the Department of Education to list those publications that are going out to the libraries of the high schools, and to advise the faculties and superintendents of the type of propaganda it really is.

Let me read a part of one of these publications, where, after they have told the school children of the great systems of their country and how much better off they are than the children of this country, they say this, referring to their own country:

And today the country of peace, the country building the great structure of communism, Stalin's country, is our friend, our supporter, and our ally.

That is the kind of material that is being sent to the libraries of the high schools throughout this country, telling a beautiful story and then saying, "The country of peace, the country building the great structure of communism, Stalin's country, is our friend, our supporter, and our ally."

I submit it would be much better for the Department of Education to spend some of their time in advising the schools of the type of literature that is being sent out than some of the sheets that they have been publishing and disseminating through the country.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. In connection with the remarks which Mr. McGrath, former Commissioner of the Office of Education, made, as he withdrew from that position, with rather a bitter attack upon the President of the United States and some unkind remarks about the Congress of

the United States. Mr. McGrath said that the budget presented by the President was woefully insufficient, and the Department could not be operated in the manner in which it had been operating. I should like to invite the attention of Members of Congress to the hearings on this bill wherein Mr. McGrath, in answer to a question by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] stated that he was sending 40 people from his office to a convention up at Atlantic City. If that is the type of operation about which we have been speaking in considering the Truman budget, I think the American people will be very happy to have less people go to less conventions.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] condemning some of the cuts that the committee has recommended in the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare; and tomorrow I will cast my vote to restore those funds that are needed to operate these various Departments efficiently. Today I wish to confine my remarks to vocational education.

The original 1954 budget recommended for vocational education under the George-Barden Act was \$16,673,261, the same as the previous year. This figure was reduced approximately 25 percent, to \$14,048,840, in the revised budget. The protests against this drastic reduction of educational funds were so general that the committee restored a little more than one-third of the cut, bringing the total back to \$16,048,870. This is 14 percent less than the amount available for the current year.

I am for economy, but I do not intend to vote to deny high-school students the right to have an agriculture, a home economics, or any vocational training teacher. It is passing strange to me that a country which appropriates money for defense against communism at the rate of \$120 million per day, refuses to appropriate as much as \$50,000 per day to train its future citizens for a maximum production on the domestic front. It is generally recognized that poverty, unrest, and unemployment are the top producers of communism. The vocational education program is undoubtedly one of the best defenses against communism. It will also go far toward strengthening the home defenses by increasing production on the long-range plan. It is false economy to curtail this program at this time.

This program was first started in 1915 with the enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act, and the appropriation was gradually increased until about 1925, when it reached the sum of \$7,138,331, and continuously thereafter we have appropriated that amount. The cut that the committee made affected the George-Barden funds only by reducing the orig-



inal budget figure of \$18,673,261 down to \$16,048,870—approximately 14 percent below the figure for fiscal 1953. This program deserves better treatment.

We gave away in the offshore-oil bill here just a few days ago property of sufficient value to guarantee a sound educational program in this country for the next 100 years and a sound building program in this country for the next century.

In Kentucky alone this proposed cut will amount to approximately \$120,000. Unless these funds are restored, 34 departments of agriculture, 13 departments of home economics, and all the programs of distributive education will be eliminated in Kentucky. In the district that I am privileged to represent it will be necessary to withdraw Federal funds for seven departments in the Mayo State Vocational School in Paintsville, Ky. This alone would affect 125 boys in one school.

What else is taking place? A majority of the legislatures do not meet until year after next. Down in Kentucky—and it is true throughout the Nation—teacher hiring begins soon after the first of any calendar year. For several months the respective local boards of education have been hiring their teachers down in Kentucky and the State department of education has entered into contracts with local boards of education committing the \$120,000 that is Kentucky's share of this proposed cut. The loss of this money, therefore, would make the repudiation of those contracts mandatory. We all know that there are many girls and boys who are unable to go to college. Why cut; why deny those boys and girls the opportunity to be taught some trade in high school that will be profitable to them and the country in later years? And that is just what we are doing here by this small cut.

I am hopeful that the Committee tomorrow will reverse the Appropriations Committee and grant the full amount as provided in the original budget.

I intend to support the Barden amendment.

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

(Mr. DODD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, on Saturday, May 23, 1953, the Hartford Turners, Inc., will celebrate its 75th anniversary.

This organization is not only one of the oldest of its kind in the city of Hartford, but is as well one of the most respected. Over the years its members have made a substantial contribution to the community life of Hartford and the Greater Hartford area. Among its members are some of our outstanding citizens, and I take this opportunity today to congratulate this splendid organization on 75 years of worthwhile activity.

Of the various organizations which participated in the democratic movements during the nineteenth century, one of the outstanding was the Turner

movement. Many members of the Turners, who were opposed to Prussian militarism, migrated to the United States to find new homes in a truly free country. This migration resulted in the establishment of many turnverein which upheld their democratic traditions and brought German culture to the United States.

Over the last 75 years the turnverein of Hartford has compiled an exceptional record toward strengthening the democratic spirit and enriching the cultural heritage of our land.

No nation has played a more vital part in the building up of western civilization than Germany. In almost all fields of human endeavor—philosophy, music, literature, medicine—German names appear at the head of the list of immortals.

Today, as we are engaged in a battle for the preservation of our civilization, a democratic Germany is in the forefront of the fight against communism. Under the leadership of Chancellor Adenauer, Western Germany is striving for a united and strong free Germany and a united strong free world.

For Germany must be united and free before there can be a lasting peace in Europe or in the world. Germany can and will be again a great stabilizing influence. In a little more than 8 years, Germany has come a long way on the road back to her proper place in the family of nations.

During these more than 8 years, we of the United States have been working toward that end, and we shall continue to do so until this objective is obtained.

The industrial and organizational genius of the German people, which played so important a role in the development of the United States, has brought about an amazing recovery of German economy in the last 8 years. Overall production is already 60 percent above the 1936 level. It is expected that by 1956 the steel mills of Western Germany will break an alltime production record.

The shadow that hangs over Western Germany is the knowledge that in the East their countrymen are living under a reign of Soviet terror. Kremlin agents use every means at their command to crush the German people.

Just a few days ago I again spoke on the floor of the House, calling for the exposure of these Communist acts. I appealed for the adoption by the United States Senate of the Genocide Convention, a law which makes it criminal to destroy groups by such acts as killings, mutilations, deportations, concentration and slave-labor camps, and the breaking up of families. The people of Eastern Germany look to us for help to free them from Soviet subjugation and rescue from mass murder. We cannot fail them.

We shall need all our material weapons in order to bring about the defeat of tyranny in the world. But, as the turnverein have always taught us, there is a close relationship between moral and physical strength. One can never succeed without the other.

Knowing that it shall continue to work for the further growth of our country and to fight for our democratic ideals,

I wish the turnverein of Hartford every success for the future.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I should like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for his brilliant and masterful analysis of an appropriation bill such as the one now under consideration which totals almost \$2 billion. The viewpoints he expressed with regard to the various items contained therein are the viewpoints of many of us here in the House.

Mr. Chairman, during my 9 years of service on the House Appropriations Committee it was my duty and pleasure at one time for a period of 4 years to serve on the Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee, which has now become the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee. Out of that service grew a knowledge and familiarity with the problems of public health which have sustained my interest in the intervening years. The program of research under the sponsorship of the National Institutes of Health has occupied my attention not only because it affects the basic health of the people in the district which I represent but because it has such a direct bearing on the health of the people of this country as a whole.

I have seen the Institutes of Health at Bethesda grow in scope and accomplishment, and I have felt a pride and admiration for the development of their activities. We in the Congress have helped this work by providing funds each year for the various institutes and by and large each year has seen some increase in the major disease areas which are under exploration. This year again it is fitting that the funds appropriated for research and collateral activities in the Institutes of Health are at least fractionally higher than last year. At that rate research now under way will be able to continue even though relatively few new projects will be undertaken. I am somewhat puzzled, however, and disappointed that the very eloquent plea for funds for the construction of laboratories and kindred facilities by the most eminent medical men in the country has gone unanswered.

In the testimony before the subcommittee there was a unanimity of conviction among the medical authorities that construction funds were necessary this year if we were to continue making progress at the rate we should. In the field of heart disease Dr. T. Duckett Jones, of New York, stated:

There is a desperate need for further laboratory space, not elaborate, gaudy, luxurious things, but a roof and tools with which to work. One hundred and twenty-two of our leading schools and institutes in the country have indicated they desperately need construction funds and have told us the needs are in the neighborhood of \$36 million.

In the field of arthritis and metabolic diseases Dr. Joseph Lee Hollander, of the University of Pennsylvania, said:

There are few laboratories available in this country for learning the basic mechanisms



involved and testing out treatments. \* \* \* Our own laboratory has been a typical example. Our discovery of the effectiveness of compound F or hydrocortisone, when injected directly into swollen joints was only made possible by a grant from the National Institutes of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases. Had we not received this, the idea like those of many others, would have died on the vine instead of becoming a worthwhile additional aid in the management of arthritis. Well staffed and well equipped research laboratories are needed in many institutes to study the basic factors involved in these diseases and to evaluate and study new agents used in treatment.

In the field of cancer Dr. Norman Topping, speaking of the Gates Memorial Pavilion in Philadelphia, said that in the total financing of the pavilion at a cost to his university of \$6,950,000, a grant of \$1 million from Hill-Burton funds together with two smaller research construction grants, 1 for cancer and 1 for heart, totaling another half million, his university was able to raise about \$6 million additional. He said:

I think it is quite important for us to realize that this seed corn put down in our local community gave us the impetus, gave us the ability to show to our community itself that this building, this area in construction could be financed, that it was possible with their help; and we were successful. We would never have been able to build the Gates Pavilion without the impetus from these relatively small amounts of money.

Again, in the field of cancer, Dr. Sidney Farber, of Boston, Mass., one of the finest men in the field, described the activities of the Children's Hospital of Boston and the Children's Cancer Research Foundation. He spoke of the wonderful work being done on children with cancer and said:

The work began with appropriations from the program we have been talking about today. The first research began with a \$10,000 grant from the National Cancer Institute. The million-and-a-half-dollar building was stimulated by a grant of a hundred thousand dollars from the National Cancer Institute for equipment. Just as Dr. Topping mentioned the case in Philadelphia, we have the stimulation of private donors on the basis of a Federal grant for a small part of the whole.

James S. Adams, a New York banker, active as a civic-minded citizen in the cancer problem, spoke of the remarkable results gained from construction funds expended in the past. Reviewing construction for fiscal years 1948, 1949, and 1950, he said during those 3 years Congress appropriated \$16,303,000, a total of \$25 million.

There have been no appropriations for construction in 1951, 1952, or 1953, although we have advocated the completion of the \$25 million program in each of the last 3 years. To the \$16,303,000 already appropriated and very largely expended, I am glad to tell you that the expectation we had as to the availability of other funds was fully realized. For every Government dollar, six additional dollars have gone into building from private and other local sources. So, for the \$16,303,000 of Federal funds, there has been nearly \$100 million of additional funds, or a total of upward of \$120 million, resulting. The \$16,303,000 was allocated to 55 different construction projects at 49 institutes in 27 States; 46 of these projects

have been completed and it is expected that the remaining 9 will be finished this year.

And in the field of mental health Mr. Charles Schlaifer, an advertising man and cochairman of the National Mental Health Committee, said:

The physical plant in this [mental health] field is woefully inadequate for the training and research machinery to accomplish the monumental tasks set for it by the mounting hospital problem. The construction item requested in the mental health budget is \$2½ million. It is a genuine first step, of course, but the figure is so small as to be only a token amount. For 3 years we have included in our citizens' proposal a request for \$8 million in construction grants on the basis of requests from bona fide medical and other training schools and research centers of \$13 million. At the present time there are on file requests for construction grants amounting to more than \$22 million. The medical schools are bursting at the seams for lack of space to permit teachers and students to get together. Adequate clinical facilities are lacking, the laboratories and other facilities and clinical research projects are so insufficient in so many cases that some of the foremost medical and research men are unable to follow up on promising leads they uncover.

In the light of this testimony from doctors whose knowledge of medical research is unchallenged and from businessmen who understand these problems from a financial point of view, it seems to me that the need for construction is an overwhelming and compelling one. I am happy that funds for research were maintained at last year's level, but I deeply regret that some funds were not provided for construction, and I hope that this Congress will find it possible to meet this great and serious need in the public health picture.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word on behalf of the work of the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the Department of Labor. In Fort Wayne, Ind., my home town, I have observed some of the activities of this Bureau and the results of those activities. Within my knowledge, I must state that the program has been most beneficial.

First of all, it has been well ordered and operated with a view to the conservation of public funds. In this connection, there is a rather wide participation by a number of States which certainly is a good thing as it ties the Federal program to the more local activities.

The program also has a bearing upon veterans' problems. The record of the hearings shows a great many veterans are now participating in the program and, if it is continued, many more will no doubt take advantage of it.

Finally, I think it should be stressed that here is an instance in which management and labor are cooperating to produce skilled workers for the benefit of all. This is the type of cooperation that should be strengthened and encouraged, but to provide such encouragement it is necessary that the activities of the Bureau of Apprenticeship be continued. If that Bureau is limited too much by lack of funds, it cannot achieve these worthwhile goals.

I hope that the Congress will see fit to make adequate financial provision for this productive activity.

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN].

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to take the opportunity to compliment my colleague from Chicago [Mr. BUSBEY], chairman of the subcommittee. He has done a very good job. He has been very diligent, and has worked long hours in a conscientious effort to do a job here; and to do the job on a bill like this calls for a lot of work plus a lot of, might we say, abuse, because it is not popular to cut expenses and it is not popular to cut the funds of departments, all of whom feel they are the ones who should be given extra funds.

I expect tomorrow to support the chairman of the committee and the committee itself on any amendments that may be offered to this bill, but I wanted this time to present some viewpoints with reference to one of the problems.

I note that this bill provides \$377,000 less for the Bureau of Labor Statistics than the amount it has this year. It is my understanding that the administration recommended that this Bureau's work be continued at about its present level. I recognize that the committee feels that it must make economies wherever it is practicable in order to save money for us all, although sometimes these reductions might be made where they would mean loss of the quality of service of the Federal Government that has proved useful in the past.

I note especially in the report that the committee has specifically disallowed the requested increase for housing and public construction statistics, and I would like to comment on that item.

A number of the headquarters of important home-building organizations are in the city of Chicago, and I am familiar with the way in which they have used these statistics. As I understand it, the Bureau of Labor Statistics requested to be allowed to use some funds that it has been using in other ways this year to review and improve these statistics, which show the total number of new homes started in the United States every month. It is this set of figures on housing starts, so-called, which the Congress used in the Defense Production Act passed last summer as a basis to decide when controls on housing credit under regulation X should be suspended. It is my memory that these regulations were suspended after the number of housing starts at an annual rate had fallen below 1,200,000 for 2 or 3 successive months. The act provided that those controls could be reinstituted if the amount of home building again goes above 1,200,000 for a certain length of time.

I understand from some of the other home-building organizations in Chicago that all of the people in the industry familiar with these statistics are of the opinion that they should be improved. These figures which come partly from



building permits and partly from records of houses being built in areas outside building-permit areas, are now put together on the basis of population figures from the 1940 census. All of us know how many localities grew out of all proportion to others during and after the war. The 1950 census figures are available, and these building people think, as does the Bureau of Labor Statistics, that the figures we are using in 1953 should be based on the 1950 censuses of population and housing.

A report from the United States Chamber of Commerce says the two most important series on construction are: First, the number of nonfarm houses started, compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics; second, the dollar value of work put in place, prepared jointly by the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

This series on housing statistics is the first one mentioned in this report. It is not often that we have a request of this kind from the chamber of commerce, backed by a committee of people from the industry who are familiar with this kind of information.

All of us depend upon the Bureau of Labor Statistics from long standing for a lot of statistics, and we count on the Bureau to make them so that they are good and accurate. If the Bureau says that a set of statistics is not as good as it could be made and should be made, and they are confirmed in this view by the people in the industry, I think we should go along with them.

I hope the House will take into consideration that these statistics are used in the forecasting of their market by producers of building materials of all kinds, by retail lumber yards, by the suppliers of equipment, and by the big construction firms themselves. There is no other national set of statistics on the number of homes being built each month. This is such a big industry and employs so many people, both on the job and in producing materials, that I believe we should make sure we have a good, sound record of how much activity is going on every month.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I feel privileged to associate myself in support of the views so ably presented today by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. I favor economy in our Federal Government; the type of economy promised during the campaign of last year by the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle; an economy brought about according to their promises by increased efficiency in Government, by elimination of duplication and waste; not an economy secured through the destruction or crippling of social programs.

The new administration pledged itself to increasing rather than lessening the scope of our social programs. The cuts proposed in the bill presently under debate are in every instance aimed at specific reduction in programs most beneficial to the American people, programs designed for better utilization of our

greatest resource—the human resources of this Nation.

A number of the cuts contained in this appropriation deal specifically with programs important to my State. They reduce or eliminate Federal participation to a degree which will wreak havoc with many of the cooperative activities in which my State participates.

California is not in the happy position of having huge uncommitted surpluses, of being free from bonded obligation. In my State, we have strained every resource to meet the problems brought about by the most rapid increase in population of any State in the Union. We have not been content to lay down on the job, looking to the Federal Government to bail us out. But the pressures of growth, aggravated in many instances by the defense activities of the Federal Government, have forced us to look to the Federal Government to meet a responsibility which is not solely ours.

I am particularly concerned with the impact of these reductions as they deal with the educational activities of my State. Our local school districts have planned their programs on the basis of the laws of this Nation committing it to support of specific educational programs. The budgets of these local school districts are made up. The tax rate is set. The ability on their part to underwrite a greater share of the total cost of an educational program is limited by law. They will be severely penalized if, in this appropriation bill, we repudiate the moral obligations of the Federal Government.

I will support the amendment which will be offered tomorrow to restore the funds eliminated by the committee. In supporting an increase beyond the committee recommendation, I will be acting in a manner which keeps faith with State and local government.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly impressed by the lack of substantial testimony in the report of the committee and the hearings before the committee which would tend to justify the drastic cuts which have been made. As I stated before, economy is a desired objective of any responsible legislator, but it should not be brought about without regard to the human element, without regard to the responsibilities to the public welfare which any representative government should and must assume.

The gentleman from Rhode Island has dealt extensively with each item of reduction proposed by the committee. It is not my intention to duplicate his remarks. I want to emphasize that I do subscribe to his views, that I feel he has most ably presented the case for the people in the remarks made earlier by him. I shall support his amendments. I hope the House will carefully consider the effects of the cuts proposed and recognize the wisdom of accepting a policy which continues to recognize the responsibilities of a wise and forward-looking Government.

(Mr. MOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to

the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDON].

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for the most able presentation of his viewpoint on the Labor and Health, Education and Welfare appropriation bill. Mr. FOGARTY gave one of the most lucid and moving presentations that I have heard since I have been a Member of this body. I am in complete accord with the point of view which he has expressed. I feel it particularly regrettable that the Appropriation Subcommittee saw fit to make the cuts which it made in the fields of public health and of education.

I cannot help but compare the treatment given the Department of Agriculture in its appropriation bill with that given the agencies concerned in this bill.

The Appropriations Committee, on the Agriculture appropriation bill, actually raised the request for funds made by the administration. The agencies herein concerned, however, were deeply and severely cut down. The spokesmen for agriculture throughout the Nation are articulate, and the farmers are well-organized. In addition, the farm community is in a position to wield considerable political influence. As a result, they attained more than the administration was willing to grant them.

The sick and disabled and our school children do not have the political strength or the recognized spokesmen, and as a result they are to suffer. While it is true the cost of government must be trimmed down, I do not think it should be trimmed at the expense of proven programs which directly benefit large segments of our population. Economies that close hospitals, that cut down on medical research, that lessen the vocational rehabilitation program, that cut down the funds promised by past Congresses to our school districts, that cut back the vocational education program, are not economies demanded by the American public.

In my own district in California if the funds promised under Public Law 874 are not made available, some of our schools may not be able to complete an entire academic year. So great is the Federal impact in my district, which contains Mare Island Navy Yard, Travis Air Base, Port Chicago Naval Magazine, Camp Stoneman and Benicia Arsenal, that it is absolutely impossible for the school districts to raise from local taxes sufficient funds to offset the moneys being cut in this bill.

I feel that I must raise my voice in protest, and I hope that this body, when it considers the amendments tomorrow, will undo much of the harm that was done when the bill was presented to us in its present form.

(Mr. CONDON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat surprised that in the fact of our stated intention to strengthen the



Department of Labor we are, in fact, considering a rather drastic curtailment of the budget for that Department. I am sure that our committee has considered in detail the needs of the various bureaus, but I am concerned about some of the cuts that I have had time to study.

As you all know, one of the duties of the Department is to study employment and unemployment. Their data are compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Bureau of Employment Security in cooperation with the State governments. In the area I come from, Cambria, Indiana, and Armstrong Counties, we have large coal and steel industries and thousands of small businesses. It is important for me to know the trend of employment and unemployment here. The Department has these data; but if we cut the budget as drastically as proposed, it will reduce this cooperative program on employment and unemployment.

I am concerned more specifically about what we are proposing to do to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. As you know, this is the agency that has the major responsibility in our Government for compiling the official records on prices, wages, consumers' price index, employment, productivity, and construction, and other data.

We are proposing to cut the Bureau \$689,000 below the budget requests and \$379,000 below the current operating level. This action would cause a reduction in staff to a point well below the number of employees they had in 1948, after the 40-percent cut voted by the 80th Congress.

I have inquired into this situation, and I find that the proposed action would result in reduction of 60 to 75 people. How can we expect this Bureau to maintain accurate and reliable statistics if we cut them this much.

We specifically disallow \$95,000 for overhaul of the construction housing starts series, which are widely used around the country. If we do not allow these funds for revision, we are promulgating errors which are known to exist in the figures. Statistics are similar to automobiles and other machinery, similar to our homes; they require upkeep entailing certain costs to eliminate obsolescence. We should provide adequate funds to permit the maintenance of these important economic data; otherwise, industry, labor, and the public generally will soon lose confidence in the Bureau's work.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] for permitting me to have a few minutes on the floor. Being a new Member and having no connection whatsoever with his committee, I feel I may be presuming. However, I have listened this afternoon to these discussions and I have been very much impressed with the sincerity of both sides of the House. I must recognize, however, that we are faced with a situation which, it seems to me, should prevail upon the minds of all toward

bringing about some sort of recognition of the necessity somewhere along the line of reducing the expenditures of this great, big, overgrown Uncle Sam of ours who apparently has reached that point of indebtedness and obligations to the various agencies and various elements of society in this country that he is no longer able to meet the situation without continuing—continuing, I say—to borrow and spend in that manner which has become so disagreeable to most of the taxpayers of this day and age. I wonder if there is a parent among you who, recognizing that the members of his household were, without their own knowledge, perhaps without their own intent, bringing you to the point in your financial ability to bear the costs of your household, continued to impress upon you that they must have you give them today something more that they would like to have, would, in a sense of judgment, would you in your effort to maintain your sense of credit, your loyalty to your own obligation, continue to give those children of yours the things they ask for, simply because they wanted them and simply because you had permitted them through years of time to build up that sense of expectation from their parent. I say it is time we must begin to cut expenses of this Government. I notice on this side of the House that they have very willingly condemned every attempt to cut in the various phases of the budget, but have they at any time presented to the Members present or to those interested in bringing down the cost of Government, anything that would take place of proposed reductions? Do they want to continue to spend as they have been spending all these years, drawing upon the credit of the United States until it will no longer stand on its own?

These are serious things, regardless of politics. It is one of the things we must take into consideration and we must make up our minds that somewhere, somehow, some folks will have to suffer. The suffering will be trivial, and I think the American people have enough good sense to recognize the fact that if this Congress takes a step along the right direction, even though it be a very minimum one; if this Congress demonstrates to the people of the United States that we still respect our honor and our national credit, then I think the people will understand and will thoroughly approve of everything we do here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK].

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] for giving me this time. I had not planned to speak on this bill, but after listening to the very fine statement of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] with reference to the provisions of H. R. 5246, I feel I should not miss the opportunity of associating myself with the views that he has expressed.

I shall support amendments that no doubt will be offered tomorrow to raise certain sums as have been provided in the bill.

I would like to take these few minutes to talk briefly about vocational education. I am referring to the item in the bill which refers to the teaching of vocational agriculture, home economics, trades and industries, and the item for distributive education.

It so happens that I have had some personal experience with vocational education. When I was a student at the Ohio State University, in the College of Agriculture, a few years ago, it was my privilege to take the courses offered by the Ohio State University looking toward the position of teacher of vocational agriculture.

When I graduated from Ohio State University I received a certificate which would have entitled me to teach vocational agriculture in any agricultural high school in the State of Ohio. For a period of 8 years I was in school work, and during that time I was supervising departments of vocational agriculture and home economics; so I believe I know something about this type of work.

In the first place, the teachers of vocational agriculture and vocational home economics must be graduates of regularly accredited colleges or universities which carry on teacher training programs in this field. Students who take the courses in vocational agriculture and vocational home economics must carry on what are known as home projects; in other words, it is a combination of classroom study and practical work out on the farms, or in the homes, and provides what seems to me to be one of the most important types of education that we have today.

What I have said about agriculture applies with equal force to home economics; it applies with equal force to the trades and industries, and also with reference to distributive education, it has been my privilege to visit the classes in distributive education in the Portsmouth, Ohio, high schools where I have seen the work of the young people in this field. I regret very much that that item has been taken from this bill. I believe it should be restored.

I would like to make brief reference to the fact that in 1951 \$1,800,000 was appropriated for distributive education. In 1952 that was cut down to \$900,000, and last year it was cut to \$450,000. Those two items during the last years were restored in the Senate after they had been stricken from the House bill.

May I say again that I wish to associate myself with the efforts Mr. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, has announced he will make tomorrow to restore certain funds for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

I shall vote for the amendments which Mr. FOGARTY proposes.

I shall also vote to increase the appropriations for vocational education including vocational agriculture, vocational home economics, vocational trades and industries, and distributive education.



I wish to express my deep concern about the excessively great cuts that have been made in these four items.

The Democratic budget recommended \$18,673,261 for these services. President Eisenhower's budget recommended \$14,048,840, approximately 25 percent below the Truman recommendations. The Appropriations Committee has recommended in this bill H. R. 5246 only \$16,048,870, which is about 14 percent below the amount that was available this year.

Maintaining the American way of life based in large part on a rising standard of living, is a primary concern of the National Government. Such a standard of living can be assured only through continuously increasing the competency of the labor force. The principal factors which concern this problem involve:

A constantly rising degree of specialization and level of training are required to improve basic production efficiency ministering to the American standard of living.

The expenditure of Federal funds for the support of vocational education is returned in the form of increased earning power and greater national wealth.

The lack of vocational education in communities where it cannot exist without Federal financial assistance would deny many individuals the opportunity of increasing their standard of living through such training.

Vocational education is necessary to assure the country of economic independence and commercial supremacy, at home and abroad.

Since a constantly expanding body of skills among the laboring force is necessary to the national welfare, the initiation of training programs, and the maintenance of the strength of programs already in operation cannot be left to chance.

Federal aid to vocational education is necessary to guarantee the establishment of thoroughly tested, uniform standards, and to stimulate the States to maintain such standards. This means that—

(a) National preparedness, a Federal responsibility, can be guaranteed only by the provision for nationwide competence, and maintained on the basis of adequate minimum standards.

(b) Adequacy of standards can only be maintained through the Federal Government as a centralized agency working in close cooperation with all the States and Territories.

Vocational education is necessarily costly but there is nothing more costly than ignorance. Federal financial assistance provides for equalization of opportunity beyond basic educational experience.

Justification for Federal aid to the States and Territories for vocational education includes the following:

(a) To make the work of vocational training possible in States and localities already overburdened with the task of meeting the rapidly increasing requirements of general education.

(b) To help the States, with their widely varying resources, bear the additional costs of providing occupational training as a national service.

(c) To equalize among the States the task of preparing workers whose tendency to move from place to place is increasing, making their training for life work a national as well as a State or local duty and problem.

(d) To secure national assistance in solving a problem too large to be solved alone by thousands of local school districts.

(e) To give interest and prestige in the States to the work of preparing youth for useful and productive service.

This proposed cut in vocational agriculture, for example, will mean that each local department of vocational agriculture established in the rural schools of Ohio would receive a serious reduction in reimbursement. In vocational trade and industrial education, which is already established at a reimbursement level of only 26 percent, it would mean a further reduction of approximately one-third in reimbursement. In this particular case it is difficult to understand a cut at this time since the local vocational schools are frequently receiving requests for providing training services in defense production industries.

Actually in all four areas of vocational education, the proposed reduction in appropriations would mean not only the elimination of any possibility for the development of new programs in schools seriously needing vocational education, but would certainly result in the loss of some of the present programs. The truth of the present situation is that even with the present appropriation, increased operating costs have necessitated a reduction in the reimbursement rate from a previous 50 percent to the present approximately 30 percent, causing local boards of education to assume this entire additional burden.

(Mr. POLK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to use any more time?

Mr. FOGARTY. Only to make an announcement for the benefit of the members of the committee. I wish to mention a few of the amendments that will be offered tomorrow. One will be to the hospital program increasing the item \$500,000 to keep these hospitals from closing. An amendment will be offered to the Hill-Burton Act item increasing it from \$50 million to \$75 million. An amendment will be offered with regard to vocational rehabilitation raising it from \$20 million to \$23 million, and the item payments to school districts, I expect to offer an amendment to raise it to the Eisenhower budget of \$66,500,000. I will offer an amendment to the item for the Wage and Hour Division; one for the Women's Bureau, and one dealing with the apprenticeship-training program, and one to the Food and Drug Administration; and I know an amendment will be offered dealing with land-grant colleges and vocational education by others. I would like to advise the committee what amendments will be offered that I know of, plus the other two I just mentioned.

Mr. BUSBEY. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island have any additional requests for time?

Mr. FOGARTY. My time has just about run out.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, many years ago, during debate in the Congress, one of our revered patriots, Daniel Webster, made this statement:

Mr. President, when the mariner has been tossed for many days in thick weather, and on an unknown sea, he naturally avails himself of the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude, and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course. Let us imitate this prudence, and, before we float farther on the waves of this debate, refer to the point from which we departed, that we may at least be able to conjecture where we now are.

Mr. Chairman, we have been drifting and drifting and drifting for many years toward national bankruptcy in this country. We are approaching a national debt of \$267 billion. We acknowledge that all of these programs that have been under discussion here today are worthwhile. I am sure every Member of the House wishes we could appropriate twice as much money. But we are confronted with a fact. We have to get back to a sound economy in this Nation or the United States will go down and when the United States goes down the entire world is going over to communism.

We better look twice before we start restoring these cuts, as much as we hate to cut any item in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill down to line 2, page 2.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HALLECK], having assumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGY AND BLINDNESS

(Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. FOGARTY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)









# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued May 25, 1953

For actions of May 22, 1953

83rd-1st, No. 94

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

## CONTENTS

Adjournment.....2	Education.....1	Prices, farm.....10
Appropriations.....1,7	Forestry.....4	Reorganization.....5
Electrification.....3,8	Labor, migratory.....6	Soil conservation.....7

## HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Continued debate on H. R. 5426, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1954 (pp. 5540-87). Adopted, 123-61, a Barden amendment to restore the vocational education item to the current-year figure of \$18,673,261 (pp. 5571-85). Adopted a Busbey amendment (on behalf of the committee) to restore the estimate of \$2,501,500 for further endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanics, but Rep. Busbey said, "We are...giving the States notice that the committee will expect the States to assume this responsibility at the earliest possible date" (pp. 5586-7).
2. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 25 (p. 5590).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

3. ELECTRIFICATION. H. R. 5356, by Rep. Clardy, to increase the interest rates on REA loans from 2% to 4%; to Agriculture Committee (p. 5590).
4. FORESTRY. H. R. 5358, by Rep. Hope, to protect the surface values of national-forest lands; to Agriculture Committee (p. 5590).
5. FARM CREDIT; REORGANIZATION. H. R. 5359, by Rep. Hope, to increase farmer participation in ownership and control of the Farm Credit System; to create a Federal Farm Credit Board; to abolish certain offices; to impose a franchise tax upon certain farm credit institutions; to Agriculture Committee (p. 5590).
6. MIGRATORY LABOR. H. R. 5368, by Rep. Rhodes, Ariz., to establish a Federal Committee on Migratory Labor; to Education and Labor Committee (p. 5590).

## ITEMS IN APPENDIX

7. SOIL-CONSERVATION APPROPRIATIONS. Rep. Gwinn inserted a Richmond Times-Dispatch article opposing the increase in ACP (pp. A3007-8).  
Rep. Harrison, Va., inserted a prize-winning essay, "A Good Citizen and Soil Conservation" (pp. A3010-11).  
Extension of remarks of Rep. Arends favoring \$140,000,000 for ACP (pp. A3016-17).
8. ELECTRIFICATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Clardy favoring an increase in interest rates on REA loans (p. A3021).
9. FOREIGN TRADE. Extension of remarks of Rep. Fisher, "The United States Is a Low-

Tariff Nation" (pp. A3021-3).

Rep. Price inserted a letter from the Illinois Agricultural Association favoring trade agreements and a study of foreign economic policy (p. A3026).

10. FARM PRICES. Rep. Judd inserted an article analyzing farm-price trends in relation to other prices (pp. A3027-8).

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR MAY 25: USDA reorganization plan, H. Gov't Operations (Agriculture Committee also to attend) (Benson to testify). Import controls to protect price supports, H. Banking and Currency (Gordon, <sup>Norton</sup> Short to testify). Transfer of certain reclamation lands in S. Dak. to Forest Service, H. Interior (Grover, FS, to testify).

-O-

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 105A.

-O-





United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 99

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MAY 22, 1953

No. 94

## Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, May 25, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## House of Representatives

FRIDAY, MAY 22, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all majesty and mercy, by Thy grace we have awakened to the light of a new day, conscious of our high calling and responsibilities as colleagues and coworkers with one another in building a nobler civilization.

May we never become discouraged and disheartened by the magnitude of this task or allow our sense of its difficulties to exceed our sense of Thy divine power.

We pray that the spiritual ideals and principles may be given the place of paramount importance and become dynamic in the social order which we are seeking to establish.

May the minds and hearts of men be cleansed of all those attitudes and ambitions which cause discord and dissension and division among the nations of the earth.

Show us how we may help mankind cast out the selfish and supercilious spirit which engenders hatred and strife and may it be supplanted by the magnanimous spirit of love which makes for tolerance and sympathy, for fellowship and cooperation, for peace and good will.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of Tibor Kálmán Jalsoviczky;

H. R. 782. An act for the relief of Kurt J. Hain and Arthur Karge;

H. R. 830. An act for the relief of Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen;

H. R. 974. An act for the relief of Dr. Morad Malek-Aslani;

H. R. 1243. An act to amend the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. 16);

H. R. 1563. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain unnegotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon the death of the beneficiary-payee, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of David H. Andrews and Joseph T. Fetsch;

H. R. 2364. An act to terminate restrictions against alienation on land owned by William Lynn Engles and Maureen Edna Engles;

H. R. 2420. An act for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk;

H. R. 2667. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom;

H. R. 2990. An act to amend the act which incorporated the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States;

H. R. 3042. An act for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco;

H. R. 3389. An act for the relief of Pio Valensin;

H. R. 3406. An act to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe; and

H. R. 4605. An act to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1242. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies;

H. R. 1244. An act to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds and other purposes";

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl;

H. R. 1561. An act authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration (in Johnson City, Tenn.) to the State of Tennessee; and

H. R. 2366. An act for the relief of Fred B. Niswonger.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 28. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act;

S. 64. An act for the relief of Teodoro Egues Munagorri;

S. 67. An act for the relief of Anastasia John Tsamisis;

S. 143. An act for the relief of Hanni Marie Matuschke;

S. 261. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River flood control compact;

S. 297. An act for the relief of Dr. Arthur Tye;

S. 313. An act for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama;

S. 315. An act for the relief of Owen Lowrey;

S. 324. An act for the relief of Gregory Leon Baranowski;

S. 349. An act for the relief of May Ling Ng;

S. 351. An act for the relief of Catherine Nina Cole;

S. 360. An act to incorporate National Service Star Legion;

S. 458. An act for the relief of Angelo Gurisetti Podesta;

S. 604. An act for the relief of Maria Neglia and Angelo Neglia;

S. 677. An act to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship, and for other purposes;

S. 714. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken;



S. 731. An act to authorize the transfer of certain land located at Cherry Point, N. C. and for other purposes;

S. 815. An act for the relief of Steven M. Pivnicki;

S. 816. An act for the relief of Bruno Lanier;

S. 833. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective valuation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States;

S. 971. An act to authorize films, and related material, for educational use to be transmitted through the mails at the rate provided for books;

S. 1176. An act for the relief of Peter Hoskins;

S. 1262. An act for the relief of Stefanos A. Spiliotis, also known as Stephen A. Harrison;

S. 1324. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees;

S. 1387. An act for the relief of Beth Barbara (Fujiko Maezawa);

S. 1416. An act for the relief of Vito Rizzi;

S. 1516. An act for the relief of Akemi Terada;

S. 1521. An act for the relief of Richard Robert Kabisch;

S. 1579. An act for the relief of Mieko Kristine;

S. 1640. An act to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment of bonds in connection with certain Air Force, Coast Guard, and Atomic Energy Commission contracts;

S. 1644. An act to amend the act of May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 223), as amended, and the act of February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1111), to remove the limitation upon the rank of Director of Music, the leader of the Military Academy Band, and to remove the limitation upon the pay of the leader of the United States Naval Academy Band, and to authorize the appointment of Lt. Comdr. Charles Brendler, United States Navy, to the permanent grade of commander in the Navy;

S. 1679. An act to repeal certain acts relating to cooperative agricultural extension work and to amend the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States, Territories, and possessions receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture; and

S. 1870. An act to extend the time for filing a report by the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel established by the act of July 16, 1952.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered.

#### CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to report the bill on the Army civil functions appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1954.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5426) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5426, with Mr. NICHOLSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee arose on yesterday, the Clerk had read the first paragraph. If there are no amendments at this point, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); teletype news service; any payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; \$1,250,000.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make inquiry of the chairman of the committee about the moneys which were stricken from the bill concerning those funds which had been used yearly since 1935 for the purposes of instruction in the land-grant colleges of the United States.

Mr. BUSBEY. Several of the Members have discussed that subject with me and the subcommittee has under serious consideration at the present time a committee amendment to restore the amount which was deleted from the bill.

Mr. HOLMES. I am very happy to get that word from the chairman, and hope you will pardon me for bringing it up at this time because later on in the day I am going to be forced to be off the floor for a while and I was afraid the matter would be overlooked, but you are saying in so many words it is acceptable to the committee to reinstate those funds for the land-grant colleges?

Mr. BUSBEY. I have not yet taken it up with all of the committee members, but I will do so before we reach that point in the bill.

Mr. HOLMES. I thank the gentleman very much.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging apprentice training, as authorized by the act of August 16, 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50), \$2,700,000.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: Page 3, line 22, strike out "\$2,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,400,000."

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to restore funds to the Bureau of Apprenticeship, because I feel it is necessary to maintain this agency at full strength.

My position is based on my own personal experience in the apprenticeship field, having served an apprenticeship in the sheet metal industry. I think all members of the committee will agree with me that in this House we practice the principle of apprenticeship. Last term I served my apprenticeship. We have a number of new Members serving their apprenticeship here now. We operate on the basis that after you are supposed to have learned what you are doing you are given a little authority. That is the basis of the apprenticeship program in the building industry and in the skills. Personally, I cannot see why anyone should be against this amendment, since everyone concerned seems to be for it. The President spoke for it and said he felt the apprenticeship program and the training of our skilled labor should be increased. The Secretary of Labor has stated in his recent speech:

That valuable as the work of many of the bureaus in the Department has been, not one of them exceeds the day-to-day help which is provided by the Bureau of Apprentice Training of the Department of Labor.

We find the President for it; we find the Secretary of Labor for it; we find management for it; we find all of the organized labor groups for it, as well as the individual workmen. We find the organized veterans groups for it, because at the present time there are approximately 90,000 veterans in this program.

We heard quite a fighting speech the other day given by the gentleman from North Dakota regarding the appropriations. In fact, he made the statement that there were a lot of city slickers who did not know the difference between a combine and an airplane. I would like to say to the committee this morning there are some of us from the city who do know the difference. There are many people from the country who do not know the difference between a short nipple and a long elbow. And those are plumbing terms and not physical terms. The only way you get skilled, trained workmen is to start at the bottom and work up.

You have much construction work going on in the country today, construction work as well as private homes. I have just completed an investigation, with the help of many able Members of Congress, with respect to veterans' housing. We found that at least 75 percent of the construction complaints were traceable to the fact that we do not have skilled workmen. You have men placed on the job, but they are really not mechanics.

In view of the fact that everyone seems to be for this, and the confidence I personally have in the Secretary of



Labor, I see no reason why this amendment should not be agreed to.

This morning a pamphlet, The "Know-How" Cabinet, put out by the women's division of the Republican National Committee, was received by all the Members. These women do a terrific job. They have wonderful judgment, and here is what they say:

Secretary Durkin is a labor administrator of proven ability. He is both calm and judicious—qualities which will serve him in good stead during the months ahead. A man of great inner resource, he draws his basic strength from his church, which he serves as a daily communicant and as vice president of the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. I wonder if the gentleman could explain to us about this increased allowance for apprenticeship training. Who pays for the apprenticeship training? The Federal Government, or industry, or the labor unions?

Mr. AYRES. It is a combined payment by management and labor and those participating in the program. The apprenticeship training program is in the Department of Labor. They have been doing a particularly good job in your city of Dayton.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training actually perform the training function?

Mr. AYRES. No.

Mr. WHEELER. What function do they perform?

Mr. AYRES. It is in an advisory and help capacity, to encourage it.

Mr. WHEELER. Is it true that their major function is simply one of recruitment?

Mr. AYRES. No; I would not say that was their major function.

Mr. WHEELER. It is my understanding that their major function is one of recruitment; then they must turn these people whom they have recruited over to some other agency for actual training.

Mr. AYRES. No; that is not the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is it not true that as far as these funds are concerned under this program it is the responsibility, as the gentleman from Georgia has indicated, to encourage apprenticeship training in various industries throughout the country and that this money is used primarily for administrative purposes in the development of that program?

Mr. AYRES. That is basically right. The main thing they do which is so important is to determine which skills are needed and concentrate their efforts in those fields.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman think that his amendment goes a bit too far when it restores the whole amount? Are there not some phases of the program where administrators or field representatives can be cut without seriously injuring the program?

Mr. AYRES. Based on the 17 pages of testimony—and that is all that was heard on this point—I found nothing in those 17 pages that would justify the cut.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact, if the gentleman will yield—

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the amount that was recommended last year in the regular appropriation for 1953 was just the same as this bill now carries? And that the other amount is an addition that was put on in connection with the activities of the National Production Authority which has gone out of business? Are not just going along with the department absorbing the tag ends of the National Production Authority?

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to concur in what the gentleman from Ohio said with respect to the value of this program. Because this is a worthwhile program, the committee did not cut this appropriation below the 1953 level, excepting those funds previously provided under the Defense Production Act.

Concerning the statement of the gentleman that industry and labor and everybody else want this program and are cooperating with it, I read from the hearings on page 103:

Mr. BUSBEY. Has there been any trouble in getting both labor and management to cooperate in this program? Have you had any opposition from either side?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, there are some that give trouble, and it is a very real problem to get management and labor to do something about this. When we originally started 18 years ago, there was some difficulty in convincing the American Federation of Labor that it was to their advantage to work in this program. That opposition has largely faded away to the point where they are now aggressively promoting it.

By the same token, it was difficult to convince organizations like the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce, and State and national trade associations, to get back of this.

I think the committee has been very fair and generous on this program. We all believe in it and want it to succeed. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ayres]; goes clear beyond the revised budget figure which was presented to the committee by Secretary Durkin.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman from Ohio knows my high regard for him and his stalwart position in the House of Representatives; however, I feel compelled at this point to make a general observation.

The gentleman from Ohio spoke of the lack of justification for this cut. I suppose we could take all of the items that might be covered in any appropriation bill and find in all of them good things—things that would lead any one of us to say that would be nice to have, so let us just carry it on. But there is one overall justification that we should keep in front of us as we go through the consideration of these appropriation bills; and that is, that the people of this country look to us to maintain the fiscal solvency of our Government. Yes; they are clamoring for a tax reduction and they should have it. We live, as the President stated, in an age of peril when we are called upon to spend tremendous sums of money for our national defense and security.

Under these circumstances, may I point out again that there is an overriding justification for supporting these cuts, if they do not go too deep and if they are not destructive of some essential governmental function. That justification is against continuing the reckless spendthrift policy that has characterized the activities of the Federal Government too long. We must stand up and be counted, else we shall never balance the budget of the Federal Government, else we shall never give the people the tax relief which they are urging.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that, in recommending an appropriation of \$2,700,000, the committee has recommended as much as, or a greater amount than, has been appropriated in the regular bills for this program since its inauguration, with the exception of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952; and it is only a reduction of about 4 percent from the amount appropriated for each of those 3 years. So, I do not see how anyone can say we are crippling the program in any way. We want it carried out and we have provided sufficient funds for its operation.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the pending amendment will be voted down.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, the proposed reduction in appropriations for the Department of Labor, especially as it affects the Bureau of Apprenticeship, will have serious repercussions in the fields of business and industry.

Ever since the 1920's, when our national policy on immigration was established, it has become increasingly clear to American businessmen that we can no longer depend on the importation of foreign-trained labor. We have to depend upon our own resources to train and produce the highly skilled craftsmen that we need.



The small business owner, and the big corporation, the steel manufacturer, the repair shop, the mine manager, the railroad superintendent, the shipbuilder, and the garment maker—all of these, and many others, are today concerned about the fact that they cannot find a sufficient number of all-round trained craftsmen.

They realize, furthermore, that while the age of qualified craftsmen currently available is rapidly increasing, insufficient numbers of journeymen are being acquired through apprenticeship even for replacement purposes, to say nothing of expansion.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship has for 20 years stood in the forefront of the battle for better trained craftsmen. It has urged that more attention be given to this problem while there is yet time in which young men may receive from the older workers the skills of their trades.

Because the objectives of the Bureau have been to stimulate interest in industry of their responsibilities in training their own craftsmen, it has, heretofore, consistently received encouragement from industry as well as labor, and from both parties in Congress. Generally speaking, the opinion of those who have been assisted or advised by this agency is that the service given is impartial and technically useful.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship and co-operating State apprenticeship agencies are helping industry to acquire those workers it most needs—the craftsmen of such high skill that it takes usually 3 or 4 years to learn even the beginnings of the trade.

The best evidence of the value of the services of the Bureau of Apprenticeship is the membership of joint apprenticeship committees throughout the Nation. There are today approximately 8,000 of these committees jointly established by management representatives. Participating in these joint apprenticeship committees' endeavors are more than 120,000 business establishments and nearly 100 national or international unions. Some of the biggest corporations in the United States are included in this latter group, as well as the small-business man. This furthers the idea of getting industry to accept their responsibility for training their workers. The cost to the Government is small because industry trains and not the Government doing the job for them.

If the appropriations for the Bureau of Apprenticeship are cut, the services of that agency to American industry will have to be cut in proportion, and the extension of its technical services to other industrialists and businessmen will of necessity become impossible. The staff of the Bureau is already working at full pitch in an attempt to satisfy even current demands for its services. Any reduction in its appropriation will of necessity reduce the amount of service it can give. American industry cannot afford either the immediate or the long-run loss in craftsmanship that such a reduction in this appropriation will bring about.

In conclusion, may I remind you that this agency successfully helps industry do its own training, and Government does not do the training on behalf of industry. Apprentices produce goods and earn a livelihood while they are learning.

I therefore urge that, at the very least, the appropriation for the Bureau of Apprenticeship not be reduced.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in so much disagreement with the administration and with the committee on their recommendations with respect to this bill that it is difficult for me to understand their approach to many of the items. When you make reductions in items like vocational education, apprentice training, vocational rehabilitation, and public health, you are cutting functions that are indispensable to the growth and security of our country. Measured by most appropriations which come before the House, these items are almost insignificant. Yet, the committee has approached these items as though it was considering the multi-billion-dollar bills which we will soon be considering. It is one thing to approach functions which cost billions with a pruning knife; it is quite another to start tampering with services to our people, particularly where, as in these instances, they have already in past years been cut below the point of safety.

I have had occasion during recent years to acquire some degree of familiarity with the apprentice training program. I have become convinced that the expansion of this program is indispensable to our national defense and economic growth. We are not feeding enough young men into our skilled trades to meet the future requirements of our expanding industries.

It is a program which has met with universal approval among both labor and management. It is a program based on our traditional policy of having men trained on the job by employers and employees. It is not a job that the States can do alone. Our industrial practices do not stop at State lines. The problem is nationwide in scope, and the Federal Government should augment, rather than curtail this fine service. I sincerely hope the House will restore the cuts made in the apprentice training program.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words to speak in favor of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes I think my good friend from Indiana, the majority leader for the next 2 years at least, still thinks he has a Democratic President in the White House and Democratic members of the Cabinet. It seems to me that he and other leaders of the Republican Party have been in the minority for so long it is very difficult for them to get around to the fact they are now in the majority and that they have men of

their own choice as Cabinet officers and that they have their own President\* of the United States.

It seems to me this is a question of whether you are going to follow your President and his Cabinet or whether you are going to take the reins away from the President of the United States and run this country yourselves.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman did not vote for the administration position the other day on the \$55 million for ACP payments, and I did.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know how the gentleman from Indiana voted on that particular cut, but I did, and I think the RECORD will show I voted for that \$55 million cut on the rollcall.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman did, I am happy to give him my apology.

Mr. FOGARTY. I say, look at the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Those who voted for the \$55 million increase were voting in the direction of returning to the amount recommended by another President of the United States, President Truman, in his budget.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Ohio said, in the hearings that we have before us, there is not one word of justification for a cut in this particular appropriation. As I said yesterday, in 1947 and 1948, when the Republicans had control of this Congress, when they were cutting the Department of Labor heavier than any other agency in Government in those 2 years, this was one agency in Government that they did not touch. The Republicans and Democrats alike in 1947 and 1948 made the claim that this was one of the best agencies in Government, that had the support of labor and management, that had the support of the Federal Government and the States themselves. It is true as the chairman of this subcommittee said, that there are instances where the division of apprenticeship training has had trouble with either a labor union or some other segment of the economy in getting their cooperation, but that is exactly the reason we have the Bureau of Apprenticeship training. I think I know something whereof I speak, because I belong to one of those unions in the building trades, and I know that for years they refused to allow but only a small percentage of their membership to become apprentices. But since we have been appropriating money for this particular division of Government, we have had more cooperation, we have had more apprentices. This program is working today better than it has ever worked before.

As the gentleman from New York stated a while ago, the National Production Board is out the window. I would say to the gentleman from New York that if we were going to cut defense



spending in this country by 40, 50, or 60 percent, then maybe you could justify this cut in apprenticeship training at the present time, but the cold facts are that we are still building defense plants in this country, that we are still manufacturing planes in this country, that we are still manufacturing tanks in this country.

You will notice in the New York Times and the papers all over the east coast that every plane factory on the west coast is advertising for help on the east coast because they do not have the trained mechanics to build the tanks and planes that we need at the present time. This is the agency that can provide that help. This is the agency in Government that is the coordinating agency between the States and the Federal Government to see to it that we have an adequately trained mechanical supply in this country.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am glad the gentleman mentioned what the Republicans did for this program in the 80th Congress, and I would like to advise the committee that we have recommended almost \$600,000 more in this bill than was appropriated in 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. I will say in answer to the gentleman from Illinois, my distinguished chairman, whom I have a great deal of affection for, and enjoy serving under his leadership, that in 1946 and 1947 we were not in the emergency we have at the present time. We were not spending as much on a defense plan as we are at the present time. There was no need at that time as there is at the present time because we were not appropriating funds for defense in 1946, 1947, and 1948. We had just ended the war.

Your President said in his state of the Union message in February, which you all read and listened to, I think, that—

The administration intends to strengthen and to improve the services which the Department of Labor can render to the worker and to the whole national community.

I sincerely believe this is one place in the Department of Labor that he really meant what he said. You are going to have a chance in voting on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio to show whether you are going to support your President or whether you are going to go along with a cut that has no justification at all. Read the hearings. If you can find one place in the hearings that justifies this cut, I want you to show it to me.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. In 1947 and 1948 did we not have a GI apprentice program far greater than we have now?

Mr. FOGARTY. We did, but we are still in that, and there have been additional responsibilities put on the Bureau of Apprenticeship because of the deferment system on the apprenticeship training program we have.

Mr. YOUNGER. We were at the end of World War II at that time, and we are appropriating more money now than we did at that time for that purpose.

Mr. FOGARTY. I attempted to say that we were not in the defense spending, if the gentleman will remember, in 1947 and 1948, that we are in at the present time. Go back to the record, is all I say. The record shows it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to protest the cut which has been made in this bill in the funds provided for vocational education. Last year Congress appropriated \$18,673,261 for the promotion and further development of vocational education.

On the theory that vocational education has matured to the point where its further development should gradually be turned over to the States, Federal funds have been reduced by \$2,624,391. This is a severe cut. These funds should not be cut at all.

There is no more fundamental activity of Government than to provide education, including vocational education, for young folks. The great vocational educational system which we have today providing agricultural training in our schools for farm boys and girls has been made possible by Federal cooperation.

We must not reduce our support of vocational agricultural training. It is one of the best investments that can be made in the interests of more efficient agriculture. Thousands of young farm operators today are doing a much better job of farming than their fathers did because they had vocational agricultural training. The greatest differences are noticed in the poorest agricultural areas. These Federal funds help most in the poorer areas. Yes; the more wealthy States and communities can carry on their own vocational educational program, but the poorer communities may not do it without the help of Federal funds.

The cut in these funds in this bill is a step backward.

Letters and telegrams follow:

BATON ROUGE, LA., April 16, 1953.  
Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,  
Member, House of Representatives,  
House Office Building.

I have been advised that proposed amendments to budget for Federal Security Agency would reduce appropriation for vocational education as provided in George-Barden Act by \$4,624,391 which is 24.76 percent of amount received this fiscal year. If such action is taken by the Congress our Louisiana programs in vocational agriculture, home economics, distributive education, and trade and industrial education will be seriously affected. It will probably be necessary for the State to reduce the number of vocational programs in proportion to the cut in Federal funds. Thousands of young people and adults would be deprived of valuable

vocational training. We understand that hearing will be given before House subcommittee handling vocational appropriation on April 21. We will appreciate your giving all of the assistance possible to seeing to it that these funds are maintained at the present level for the fiscal year 1954. In fact, we need additional vocational funds to meet the needs. Your support in the House of a movement to restore any proposed cut in vocational funds to the extent that no less money will be available for vocational education for fiscal 1954 than is available for this fiscal year will be appreciated.

SHELBY M. JACKSON,  
State Superintendent of Education.

BATON ROUGE, LA., May 20, 1953.  
Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Louisiana has had more student participation in school-lunch program this year than at any time in history. Additional children reaching school age will increase participation during coming session. It is urgent that school-lunch appropriation remain the same as it was during past fiscal year. Any reduction will seriously handicap program operations in State. It is false economy to deprive school children of this important health and nutrition program. We are calling on you to do what you can to maintain school-lunch appropriation. Thank you for your cooperation.

SHELBY M. JACKSON,  
State Superintendent of Education.

BATON ROUGE, LA., May 19, 1953.  
Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,  
House of Representatives:

Understand Appropriations Committee cut vocational rehabilitation below present inadequate level and considerably below administration's budget figure. We urge you to do all you can to restore appropriation to at least budget figure of \$23 million.

EDWARD P. DAMERON,  
Commissioner of Public Welfare.

BATON ROUGE, LA., April 29, 1953.  
Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

We have been advised that Bureau of Budget has recommended cut of 25 percent in George-Barden funds. Louisiana Vocational Association strongly opposes any reduction in funds and respectfully requests you to use your influence in Congress to prevent any cut in funds now available. Several hundred teacher-members of our organization and thousands of Louisiana citizens will appreciate your active support of our program by preventing any reduction.

ONA SMITH,  
President, Louisiana Vocational Association.

BATON ROUGE, LA., May 20, 1953.  
Congressman GEORGE S. LONG,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Have been advised funds for vocational rehabilitation have been reduced below administration budget. Louisiana unable to meet demands rehabilitation cases because of insufficient funds. This program has proven to be of inestimable value to handicapped people who never had hope of opportunity to make contribution to society. Thousands have been rehabilitated; many taken off charitable rolls and made independent taxpaying citizens. Therefore, I am of opinion that such reduction is false economy. Will appreciate your having appropriation amended to its original budget figure.

SHELBY M. JACKSON,  
State Superintendent of Education.



NEW ORLEANS, LA., April 25, 1953.  
Congressman GEORGE LONG,  
*Washington, D. C.:*

Urgently request promotion and support of legislation including George-Barden Act providing adequate funds for vocational education.

Mrs. E. BROOME SWEENEY,  
President, Practical Nurses of  
Louisiana, Inc.

BATON ROUGE, LA., April 20, 1953.  
Congressman GEORGE LONG,  
*Washington, D. C.:*

Urgently request promotion and support of legislation including George-Barden Act providing adequate funds for vocational education.

BATON ROUGE TRADE SCHOOL,  
JEROME BOWLING, Jr., Director.

WINNFIELD, LA.

Hon. GEORGE S. LONG.

DEAR SIR: The home-economics teachers of Winn Parish hereby urge that you oppose reduction of George-Barden funds for vocational education. Thank you for your consideration.

Mrs. NAOMI CRAWFORD,  
Winnfield High School.

Mrs. DOROTHY SHELTON,  
Atlanta High School.

Mrs. ELGA SIKES,  
Dodson High School.

Mrs. MONA FAYE FORDHAM,  
Sikes High School.

Miss RUTH WIMBER,  
Calvin High School.

BATON ROUGE, LA.

Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,

*House Office Building:*

Urge maintaining school-lunch appropriation as during past fiscal year. School-lunch program vital to health and nutrition of school children.

AGNES BLAZEK,  
Steering Committee, Louisiana State  
Nutrition Committee.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., May 21, 1953.  
Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,  
*Care House Office Building,*  
*Washington, D. C.:*

For sake of the health of our children, we urge that school-lunch appropriation be kept at \$83½ million.

LOUISIANA ASSOCIATION OF  
PUBLIC HEALTH WORKERS.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,  
Baton Rouge, April 15, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,  
*House Office Building,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LONG: Your assistance is earnestly requested in preventing further cuts in Federal funds for vocational education. If Congress follows the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, our program in Louisiana will be seriously handicapped.

Amendments to the budget for the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency, recently transmitted to Congress by the new administration, propose a cut of \$4,624,391 or 24.76 percent in the George-Barden appropriation for vocational education.

The appropriation for distributive education in the Nation was \$28,852.48; in 1952 it was cut to \$15,000; and this year we have only \$8,655.84. The State appropriation has not been increased so many programs of training were discontinued and no new schools could be opened.

Boys and girls in Louisiana help schools enrolled in distributive education courses go to school part-time and work in retail, wholesale, and service businesses part-time under a cooperative training plan. Last year the

611 students earned over \$350,000 in conjunction with their training and paid an amount in Federal income taxes greater than the amount of Federal dollars spent in their training.

Because of our experience with reduced funds for distributive education we are convinced that the proposed further reduction of funds for vocational education will impair our training program for youth and adults and jeopardize economic progress in Louisiana.

I earnestly request your support of vocational education and your vigorous opposition to the cut proposed by the Bureau of the Budget. The House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Labor Department and the Federal Security Agency has scheduled hearings on vocational education on April 21. If you can arrange to speak for vocational education before the committee, or with members of the committee I shall appreciate it.

Sincerely yours,  
DONOVAN R. ARMSTRONG,  
Supervisor, Distributive Education.

GEORGETOWN, LA., April 17, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,  
Member of Congress,  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. LONG: I have been informed that there is a proposed reduction by the new administration of George-Barden funds for vocational education. As a teacher of vocational agriculture and one who sees at first hand what this type of vocational training has to offer boys and girls in rural areas and in many urban areas, I wish to state that if funds are tampered with it will endanger to a great extent the professions of farming, home-making, trades, and industry in a time when we should be trying harder than ever to maintain them all.

Therefore, after talking with many people of my respective community, I ask your help in keeping the vocational funds as they were for the fiscal year 1953.

I understand that over \$4 million is proposed to be cut in the budget as it now stands. During the fiscal year of 1953, the appropriations were nearly \$20 million.

Hearing on this phase of the proposed cut is scheduled for April 21, so it is requested that you do all in your power to help stem the urge to reduce worthwhile appropriations such as this.

Thanking you very much for your past considerations, I remain  
Sincerely yours,

W. W. LYLES,  
Vocational Agriculture Teacher.

ST. TAMMANY PARISH SCHOOL BOARD,  
Covington, La., April 17, 1953.  
The Honorable GEORGE S. LONG,  
*House Office Building,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR DR. LONG: I understand that the Federal Security Agency budget will be cut about 25 percent for vocational funds. These funds would be used under the provisions of the George-Barden Act of Congress. This, of course, means that Federal funds for agriculture, home economics, distributive education, and trade and industrial education will be reduced by approximately that amount. As you know, this reduction will be passed on to the Parish School Boards if the cut is sustained by Congress.

This letter is an earnest plea to have Congress appropriate at least as much money for the fiscal year 1954 as was appropriated for this fiscal year. We need this money badly here in St. Tammany Parish. We are bonded up to the hilt for new buildings, both white and colored schools, and having no oil fields or revenue from severance taxes, we, of course, would be extremely hard put to absorb this 25 percent cut from local funds. Please do everything possible to have the

committee and the Congress go along with at least the same amount of money for the coming year.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, and the thanks of all the school people for your efforts in our behalf in matters of this kind, I am

Cordially and sincerely yours,  
WILLIAM FITCHER,  
Superintendent.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Baton Rouge, April 18, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE LONG,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. LONG: I am very much alarmed at the proposal by the new administration to reduce appropriation to George-Barden funds for vocational education. If this materializes it will seriously affect all phases of vocational education being carried out by schools throughout the Nation.

I understand that there is a proposed reduction of the amount of \$4,624,391 for fiscal year beginning in July 1953. It is the opinion of all concerned that there is barely enough allocation as it is at present and if there is a reduction in this it will almost stop progress in the vocational field.

If there is any assistance you can possibly be in seeing that this reduction does not materialize, we the people of Grant Parish will be certainly grateful to you.

Respectfully,  
W. L. RAMBO.

GEORGETOWN, LA., April 18, 1953.  
Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,  
Member of Congress, Eighth District,  
State of Louisiana.

DEAR MR. LONG: This is to let you know that we are concerned about the proposed reduction by the new administration of George-Barden funds for vocational education. Should this cut in funds go through, it will practically stop all phases of vocational education now being carried on in the public schools throughout the Nation.

We believe that this type of training is essential for our young people in America. Such work as vocational agriculture, home economics, industrial education, and many others will no longer be able to carry on.

It is understood that the amended budget recommends only \$14,048,840 for carrying out the provisions of the George-Barden Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. This is a cut of \$4,624,391 in the recommended budget passed upon in the fiscal year of 1953.

Therefore, we ask your help and consideration in this matter and hope that you will exert your energies to assist in maintaining the above funds.

Thanking you very kindly for your past cooperation, I remain,  
Sincerely yours,

G. L. BARRETT, Jr.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,  
BATON ROUGE TRADE SCHOOL,  
Baton Rouge, April 20, 1953.  
Dr. GEORGE LONG,  
Congressman from Louisiana,  
*House Office Building,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR DR. LONG: We in the Baton Rouge Trade School appreciate very much your fine record of promotion and support for legislation for vocational education. We thank you for the excellent work you have done for us in the National Congress.

The purpose of this letter is to request that you support legislation to prevent reduction in funds provided by the George-Barden Vocational Education act. While we realize full well the need on the part of the Federal Government to effect many economies, we feel that the large and important vocational industrial education training program being carried on by this school and others like it



will justify vocational education funds being maintained at their present level. The conservation of national natural resources and the efficient training of a large number of industrial workers can be effected by the continued benefits provided by funds appropriated in the George-Barden Vocational Education Act.

Yours very truly,  
JEROME BOWLING, Jr.,  
Director.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., April 23, 1953.  
Congressman GEORGE LONG,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Urgently request promotion and support of legislation including George-Barden Act providing adequate funds for vocational education.

Yours truly,  
J. BOWLING.

CLOUTIERVILLE, LA., April 20, 1953.  
The Honorable GEORGE S. LONG,  
United States Representative,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Knowing you are interested in our farmers and their welfare, I'm calling your attention to the proposed cut in George-Barden funds which would seriously threaten the program of vocational agriculture in our parish, district, and State. I'm sure you are familiar with the work we agriculture teachers are doing in preparing young men for farming, assisting and teaching adult farmers, and young farmers. Our program is geared to the needs of the individual farmers and youngsters cause we visit with them regularly, live in "our" communities where we teach and thereby are best suited or qualified to assist them with their problems.

Should the George-Barden appropriations be cut, vocational agriculture would be seriously threatened; please vote against the proposed cut.

Sincerely,  
LOUIS RYDER,  
Agriculture Teacher.

AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION, INC.,  
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1953.  
IMPORTANT NOTICE

#### To Vocational Education Leaders:

The new administration has just transmitted to Congress, amendments to the budget for the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency. The amended budget recommends only \$14,048,840<sup>1</sup> for carrying out the provisions of the George-Barden Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. This recommendation proposes a cut of \$4,624,391 in the amount recommended in the Truman budget and in the amount made available for vocational education for fiscal 1953. If approved by National Congress, it will result in a cut of 24.76 percent in the George-Barden appropriation.

Efforts were made by your AVA, through prominent vocational educators and lay leaders, to get the new administration to recommend an increase in vocational appropriations, or to at least recommend no decrease.

If Congress follows the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, it will mean destruction of much of America's program of vocational education and will seriously cripple the whole program. Our hope of preventing this drastic cut is through action of the National Congress. It is the respon-

sibility of Congress to make appropriations. Congress can follow the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget or ignore them.

In times like these, Congress is likely to follow the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget because its recommendations are accepted as the views of the President. The President is now in the honeymoon period of his administration and thus, his recommendations carry unusual weight. In addition, an economy wave as to Federal spending is sweeping Congress and the Nation. It appears to be popular to cut appropriations.

It may be hard for you to believe that such a recommendation could have been made by the new administration in light of the letter written by President Eisenhower to C. M. Miller, of Kansas, copy of which is enclosed.

For your information and for comparative purposes, there is enclosed a statement regarding appropriations and budget recommendations for several programs.

It is more important than ever to get Representatives and Senators to appear before the House and Senate subcommittees on appropriations to testify in favor of vocational education and to support an all-out fight that may be waged on the floor of the House and Senate to prevent a cut in vocational funds.

You should know what to do in your State to get the support of your delegation in

National Congress. We hope you will move with speed. Time is running out. Action will come soon—very soon. Lay support is needed. Officers of farm, labor, industrial, business, and other organizations should help. If we lose this battle, it may be the beginning of a gradual year-to-year reduction in Federal funds until they are completely eliminated. We hope you will be able to rally your forces and that Members of National Congress will learn from scores of people in your State that Federal funds are essential to the maintenance of a sound and adequate program of vocational education, and that they should not be cut.

Please keep us informed of the things you do. Let us know the Representatives and Senators from your State whom we can depend upon to help carry the fight in National Congress.

Best wishes.  
Sincerely yours,

M. D. MOBLEY,  
Executive Secretary.

P. S.—A breakdown of allotments by States and the four types of vocational education are not yet available. We understand the recommendation is a cut across the board for all types of programs. If this is true, the recommendation proposes an increase for distributive education over the present appropriation.

M. D. M.

#### 1953 appropriations and 1954 budget recommendations

	Amount appropriated for fiscal 1953	Truman budget estimate, 1954	Eisenhower budget estimate, 1954	Percent increase (+) or decrease (−) of 1953 appropriation
I. Federal Security Agency:				
1. Vocational education.....	\$18,673,261	\$18,673,261	\$14,048,840	−24.76
2. Office of Education (salaries, etc.).....	2,960,000	3,250,000	2,926,000	−1.14
3. Vocational Rehabilitation.....	22,250,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	+3.28
4. Land-grant colleges.....	2,480,000	2,501,500	1,250,750	−49.56
II. Department of Labor:				
1. Bureau of Apprenticeship.....	2,700,000	3,400,000	3,324,000	+18.76
III. Department of Agriculture:				
1. Extension Service.....	27,165,956	27,169,129	27,169,129	+ .01

	1951	1952
Federal funds spent for foreign aid education programs.....	\$28,007,000	\$49,807,417
Number of people enrolled or served in foreign aid education programs.....	13,069	16,278
Federal funds appropriated for vocational education <sup>1</sup> .....	\$27,262,882	\$26,408,383
Number enrolled in federally aided programs.....	3,363,420	<sup>2</sup> 3,165,993

<sup>1</sup> Includes Smith-Hughes and George-Barden funds.

<sup>2</sup> Note that as Federal funds decreased the enrollment in vocational education also decreased. Total appropriations for fiscal 1953, \$25,958,383.03. This reduced appropriation will doubtless result in still further reduction in enrollment in vocational education.

THE ISAAC DELGADO,  
CENTRAL TRADES SCHOOL,  
New Orleans, La., April 21, 1953.  
Congressman GEORGE S. LONG,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LONG: It is our understanding that the Bureau of the Budget proposes a cut of \$4,624,391 in the amount recommended in the previous budget and in the amount made available for vocational education for fiscal 1953. If approved by National Congress, it will result in a cut of 24.76 percent in the George-Barden appropriation.

In view of the tremendous need for training to staff the industries in need of skilled workers there seems to be a real need to recommend no decrease. Your support of the vocational-education program will be greatly appreciated.

Kindest regards and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,  
MARVIN E. THAMES,  
Director, Delgado Trades School.

NATCHITOCHES PARISH SCHOOL BOARD,  
Natchitoches, La., April 21, 1953.  
Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LONG: It is with much regret that I learn from information that has come to this office through the American Vocational Association, Inc., that there will be a possible reduction of 25 percent in the amount of funds appropriated by the United States Congress for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the George-Barden Act of Congress. I feel that the money that has been appropriated by Congress for the purpose of promoting the program of vocational education, as defined in the George-Barden Act, has meant a great deal to the schools of our system as well as those of the Nation. I hope you will use your good influence to see that no reduction will be made.

Very truly yours,

E. A. LEE,  
Superintendent.

<sup>1</sup> At one time it was the plan to recommend an appropriation of only \$5 million for carrying out provisions of the George-Barden Act. This evidently was averted through efforts of friends of vocational education.



EVERGREEN HIGH SCHOOL,  
VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT,  
Evergreen, La., April 16, 1953.

HON. GEORGE S. LONG,  
United States Congressman, House  
Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LONG: I am a citizen, and vocational agriculture instructor of the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana, which is being represented by you. I reside and teach in the small farming community of Evergreen in Avoyelles Parish. I come from a family which have always supported the Long administration in any election they were in, because of the high standards of ideals that they possess, in presenting government on an equal basis of integrity, honesty, and general well-being of all the people as a whole, irregardless of race, degree, power, or wealth.

I have been teaching vocational agriculture at the Evergreen High School for the past 4 years, and have rendered my services to my people favorably and with appreciation, by solving many of the problems that confront them on the farm, and even assisting young prospective farmers in becoming established in farming. I am greatly liked in the community for the work I am doing. I am overjoyed of knowing that I am doing the job I am supposed to do, as shown by the people I serve, who have welcomed me to stay with them. Our little community has no industries or manufactures, so it depends solely on farming. As you can see there is a definite need for instruction and better improvements in agriculture.

The reason I am writing to you is in regards to a communication I have received from Mr. M. D. Mobley, executive secretary of the American Vocational Association, in which he states that there is a bill before Congress for a 24.76 percent decrease appropriation in vocational education as provided by the George-Barden Act. I understand that President Eisenhower is in favor of this decrease in order to balance the budget for the fiscal year. I am seeking your support in defeating this proposal of the Bureau of the Budget as this cut in Federal funds allotted to vocational agriculture would greatly cripple the Nation's agricultural industry, which it is so dependent upon.

I want you to know that I have voted for you and helped put you in the position you now hold because I trusted that you would represent your people best, and for that reason I know that you will see the dangers of this bill and fight it to its last degree.

I wish to express my desires and thanks for your worthwhile efforts, and I remain, Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND J. DUCOTE,  
Teacher of Vocational Agriculture.

PRACTICAL NURSES OF LOUISIANA, INC.,  
Baton Rouge, La., April 23, 1953.  
Congressman GEORGE LONG,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Strenuously request consideration of promotion and support of legislation including George-Barden Act providing sufficient funds for vocational education.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. ANNA CAILLOUET CLOUATRE,  
Secretary, Practical Nurses of Louisiana,  
Inc.

LENA STATION, LA., April 24, 1953.  
Congressman DR. LONG,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. LONG: I understand a bill is coming up soon in Congress to cut the appropriation for vocational agricultural schools.

These schools in Louisiana are doing a wonderful work, and I think anything you could do to prevent this cut in appropriation would be a great service to people of State.

Thanking you, I am

Sincerely,

LOUIS H. WISE.

ISTROUMA HIGH SCHOOL,  
Baton Rouge, La., May 1, 1953.  
Congressman GEORGE LONG,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LONG: I am urgently requesting your support of legislation including George-Barden Act which provides adequate funds for vocational education. This school has 135 boys per day in various types of vocational training in the Baton Rouge Trade School. I would not like to see this vocational program hampered on account of these boys.

Yours truly,

H. P. OVERTON, Principal.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,  
T. H. HARRIS TRADE SCHOOL,  
Opelousas, La., May 4, 1953.  
HON. GEORGE S. LONG,  
Member of Congress,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LONG: The Congress is proposing to cut financial appropriations for vocational education (Smith-Hughes, George-Deen, and George-Barden accounts). Our staff, numbering 22, joins me in pleading with you to strongly oppose any cuts in appropriations for vocational education because we are convinced that such cuts are uneconomical and will result in tremendous loss of tax revenue to the Federal Government.

As an example, last February, one of our WPA war-production trainees came to our office at night to thank us for the training he received in 1942. He advised me that, since receiving his vocational training he has worked continuously and has paid more than \$8,000 in withholding (income) taxes. The Federal Government spent an average of \$86 per student in training this group of workers, which is 1,000 percent return in 11 years.

From numerous such examples as the one cited above, we are confident that Federal expenditures for vocational education are in less than 5 years fully repaid to the United States Treasury in the form of taxes.

For the welfare of the United States of America and the well-being of our workers, we hope that you will exert your efforts toward encouraging and increasing the aid to vocational education and opposing any reduction of this aid.

Thanking you for your assistance, we beg to remain,

Sincerely yours,

STAFF OF THE T. H. HARRIS TRADE  
SCHOOL,

By GLENN MADERE, Director.

LOUISIANA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,  
Baton Rouge, La., April 29, 1953.

HON. GEORGE LONG,  
Congressman, Eighth Louisiana District,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LONG: It has come to our attention that a drastic reduction in the appropriation supporting the George-Barden Vocational Education Act is contemplated by the National Congress in the current attempt to balance the budget.

We are heartily in favor of curbing governmental expenditures in many of the numerous phases of operation, but we cannot see the wisdom of such rigid economy in the field of education.

I have been authorized by the executive council of the Louisiana State Federation of Labor to solicit your support of legislation providing adequate funds for vocational education purposes, and particularly in maintaining existing appropriations for the George-Barden Vocational Education Act.

I have also been authorized to solicit your support of legislation containing appropriations for public housing programs. As officers of this statewide labor organization, we are keenly aware of prospects for better living conditions offered to the common ordinary workingman through public housing,

slum clearance, and defense housing programs.

We are advised that the Housing Act of 1949 authorized construction of 153,000 public housing units in this fiscal year but that under legislation presented by members of the party in control of our Government at present, appropriations will be so restricted as to prohibit housing programs of any nature. It is to be regretted that this opinion apparently prevails among many of the lawmakers and we herewith urge your favorable consideration of the appeal by the American Federation of Labor to the Congress to provide funds for a public housing program comprising the minimum of 35,000 units this fiscal year as recommended by the administration in power.

We are attaching hereto a copy of a resolution submitted by the steering committee of the Southern States apprenticeship conference to the executive council of the Louisiana State Federation of Labor. The resolution, dealing with apprentice-training programs, is self-explanatory and was unanimously concurred in by the council. We trust that its contents will receive your favorable consideration.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

E. J. BOURG,  
Secretary-Treasurer, Louisiana State  
Federation of Labor.

RESOLUTION—APPROPRIATION, BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Whereas an adequate supply of skilled mechanics in all trades is essential to our national defense and national economy; and

Whereas experience has shown that the most effective way to properly train these skilled mechanics is through an apprentice-training program sponsored and conducted by joint labor-management apprenticeship committees; and

Whereas the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the United States Department of Labor has stimulated through their efforts interest in apprentice training and has rendered valuable assistance to joint labor-management apprenticeship committees in the development of apprentice-training programs; and

Whereas it is the opinion of both labor and management that their joint efforts to develop and conduct apprentice-training programs would never have become a reality without the assistance of the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the United States Department of Labor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the steering committee of the Southern States Apprenticeship Conference, representing labor and management in the 10 Southern States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas at a called meeting of this committee held in Atlanta, Ga., on April 11, 1953, That the value of the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the United States Department of Labor to labor and management and their joint apprentice-training programs be brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States. The steering committee of the Southern States Apprenticeship Conference is completely in sympathy with and endorses the efforts of the Congress to eliminate useless and wasteful Federal spending. However, the steering committee of the Southern States Apprenticeship Conference does not believe that the budget for essential functions of Government should be so reduced that our national defense and national economy will be jeopardized.

The steering committee of the Southern States Apprenticeship Conference, therefore, urges all Members of Congress to carefully study the budgetary needs of the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the United States Department of Labor to the end that adequate funds will be provided for this Bureau to function efficiently and properly; be it further



*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Members of the Congress from the 10 Southern States composing the conference and also a copy be sent to the Director of the Budget Bureau and to the Secretary of Labor.

BATON ROUGE, LA., May 5, 1953.  
The Honorable GEORGE S. LONG,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LONG: To maintain an adequate program of vocational education we need to prevent that cut of 25 percent in George-Barden appropriations.

I hope that you will always defend vocational education. Right now you can do this by voting against the cut of 25 percent recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

EULA MAE PELT,  
Vernon Parish.

P. S.—The people of our State need vocational education. Think the situation over and vote for the need of a great number of our population.

E. M. P.

NORTHWESTERN STATE COLLEGE,  
Natchitoches, La., May 6, 1953.  
Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is my understanding that the Budget Director is recommending a cut of \$4,624,391 from the George-Barden Act as recommended by the Truman budget. I also observe there was appropriated in 1952 \$49,807,417 for foreign aid education programs. That amount doubled that which was appropriated for vocational education under Smith-Hughes and George-Barden funds for 1952. The number of people served under the foreign aid program in 1952 was 16,278 while 3,165,998 were enrolled in our own vocational programs, which means we spent nearly \$3,051 more per pupil educating foreigners than was spent by the Federal Government in educating American youth on a vocational level.

No doubt the appropriation for this foreign aid program will continue to remain higher than the appropriation for our own vocational programs. It is difficult for me to see why American youth should be penalized as a result of cuts in our vocational program, while at the same time we are aiding our foreign brethren. When this budget is brought out for action on the House floor for approval by your body, I am requesting that you support our vocational education program not only in the amount that was recommended by the Truman budget but in the full amount as authorized by the George-Barden Act. All of us in the field of education will be watching with extreme interest the way our congressional representatives vote on this important legislation.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. ROBINSON,  
Professor, Industrial Education.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,  
Baton Rouge, May 8, 1953.  
Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,  
United States Congress,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LONG: It is my understanding that the proposal to reduce George-Barden funds for vocational education will be brought to the floor of the House of the United States Congress sometime during the week of May 10. The purpose of this communication is to request your cooperation in voting against this proposal.

The vocational education program in this country has made outstanding progress since

its inception in 1917, and it is continuing to make progress. It is a phase of education which trains in-school and out-of-school persons for gainful occupations and for leadership. I am sure that no one would want to see the day come when our people would be deprived of this kind of training in our educational system. The program of vocational education needs to be expanded. This need is evident right here in Louisiana.

The amount of Federal funds used in this program plays an important part in meeting the needs for vocational education in the States. A decrease of Federal funds for the vocational education program at this time would make it necessary to discontinue the program in a number of local schools in Louisiana. With the rapid expansion of the vocational education program during the past few years, local administrators have been "pinched" pretty severely in the administration of the program because they have had to administer a larger program with the same amount of funds. This is no time, therefore, to reduce the funds for vocational education. The real need is to increase the amount of funds. My plea to you at this time, however, is to ask that you vote against the proposal to reduce Federal funds for vocational education. The program cannot be effectively carried out with less money than received for the program last year.

Your cooperation in giving this matter your prompt consideration and doing what you can to retain the full amount of George-Barden appropriation for vocational education will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

W. J. PARENT,  
State Supervisor, Vocational Agriculture Education.

(Mr. LONG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 59, noes 39.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$5,100,000, of which \$981,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provision of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that a single Member of this House will question my zeal for economy in Federal expenditures. My record is clear. I have supported every cut in the budget which has been presented on this floor this year, and incidentally, I have initiated some of the cuts myself. I realize that because of our critical fiscal situation drastic cutting is imperative.

However, even under the extreme conditions which confront us there is such a thing as false economy.

There are four items in this bill which I would list in that category:

First, the hospital construction fund authorized by the Hill-Burton Act. This act, passed in 1949, authorized an appropriation of \$150 million for the construction of public and other non-profit hospitals for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years. The Congress, after the beginning of the Korean war, properly reduced appropriations for this purpose to \$75 million annually.

The Congress, having adopted a definite hospital construction program, States and localities in need of hospitals formulated plans in conformity therewith. In my district, the city of Richmond, which is the medical center for a large area of the State, was woefully in need of adequate hospital facilities. Every hospital in the city is now crowded to capacity, and has a long waiting list. It is therefore almost impossible to take care of even the emergency cases. So great is the need, that our citizens relying upon Hill-Burton funds to supplement their efforts raised by popular subscription \$4 million, and actually have over three and one-half million dollars in hand. A beautiful site has been donated, plans are being drawn and upon receipt of an allocation of the funds provided in this bill, construction will begin. Without these funds, the project cannot be undertaken, because the private contributions were made with the understanding that they would be supplemented with Federal contributions. Because of other commitments in the State, the necessary funds cannot be allocated to the Richmond project unless the full amount of \$75 million originally requested is appropriated in this bill.

The next item is that of vocational education. Nothing is more important to our national economy than to train our boys and girls to earn a living and to make a home. The vocational training program covers the teaching of agriculture, home economics, trade and industrial education, and distributive education in our public schools. Many of these subjects are taught at night for the benefit of those who have to earn while they learn. I believe that in the long run, the vocational education program returns to the economy by increased productivity a great deal more than it costs.

Distributive education has been eliminated entirely from the program under this bill. Our total civilian employment as of January 1953, was approximately 60 million. Of this number, 14,700,000 or 24.3 percent are engaged in distribution, comprising wholesaling, retailing, and service establishments. The distributive trade is the second largest source of employment, exceeded only by manufacturing, which employs 16,600,000 or 27.4 percent. Employment in agriculture accounts for only 5,450,000 or 9 percent. Surely, those employed in this large segment of our economy should not be denied training altogether.



The third item is that of vocational rehabilitation. This program deals with the rehabilitation of those handicapped by accident or disease. By restoring the earning power of those so unfortunately situated, we not only contribute to our national economy but, in addition, we restore self-respect and confidence to the afflicted.

The fourth item covers grants for resident teaching funds to State land-grant colleges under the Bankhead-Jones Act. This program has been in effect for many years and the agricultural and technical teaching programs of the various land-grant colleges are geared to it.

I am in thorough agreement with President Eisenhower that this entire subject of Federal grants to States should be reviewed. I shall support his recommendation for the creation of a Federal-State commission to study this and other Federal-State problems.

Until such a study has been made, however, and a future course of action determined, I urge the Congress to continue these appropriations at this year's level. If there is to be a change in Federal policy it should not be made until after thorough study and adequate notice to the States.

The programs in the various States have been predicated upon the assumption that Federal appropriations will continue at the same level. The legislatures in most of the States have recently adjourned. Practically none of them will be in session again until next year and most of them will not meet again for 2 years. The States, therefore, will be unable to make up these funds without calling special sessions which could cost more than the amounts involved.

The cuts proposed in this bill would make it necessary, therefore, to curtail the programs within the various States. Let us not attempt to balance the budget by decreasing the educational and training advantages presently made available to our young people and cripples by these funds. This, in my judgment, would be false economy indeed.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I notice that the gentleman has mentioned four items and that three of those which he believes should be modified by the House are in the educational category.

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I wish to join the gentleman in his statement as to the wisdom of an overall study of the whole problem of grants-in-aid. It seems to me in view of the fact that proposed amendments would merely meet the budget recommendations of Mrs. Hobby, the House should go along with the budget estimates and approve the amendments. Then, after we have made this study, under the commission to study Federal-State relations as requested by the President, see just where we stand as to Federal requirements for a sound educational policy.

Mr. GARY. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Our educational policy is gradually being evolved. It began with President Lincoln during the Civil War in the Land Grant College legislation. In the first World War, the Smith-Hughes program was added. Later other acts aiding education have been adopted. So we would be reversing the policy of long standing, beginning with the Civil War, if we reduced the aid that the Federal Government has granted to education and to the land-grant colleges.

Mr. GARY. That would be taking action, in my judgment, without proper study, absolutely regardless of the consequences which might follow.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. In many instances in these land-grant colleges they have already made contracts with teachers. Seventeen of the land-grant colleges in the South are colored, and they will be without funds.

Mr. GARY. Those funds are being used for teaching agricultural and technical courses which are needed by our young people. It is to teach them to make better farmers, better technicians, and we need trained technicians in this scientific age.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. May I ask if it is not a fact that in this particular item the present Bureau of the Budget, after special consideration, recommended that the full amount which was granted the last few years be restored and appropriated?

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Is the Congress of the United States ever going to get to the position where it realizes its responsibility to the people to present, as far as it may be, a balanced budget?

Are we ever going to get to a point where we realize that we cannot go on with grants and grants and grants and expenditures ever and ever increasing? In this bill the committee has been very solicitous of its responsibilities and of its duties to provide the funds that might be needed in places where they are needed.

I want to tell you a little bit about the first item the gentleman from Virginia spoke of, this item of grants for hospital construction. There the program was cut from \$75 million to \$50 million, and I want to tell you the manner in which that program has been administered and why it was necessary to make the cut. I will be able to give you only a few illustrations in the short time available. There was a case brought to our attention where \$50,000 a bed was spent in the building of a hospital under this program; there were cases where after the hospitals had been built they had to be closed; there were not funds

available in the local communities to keep them going. Unless programs of this kind are maintained on the proper basis the only recourse Congress has is to curtail the activities so that they must be maintained upon a proper basis.

On these educational items and the grants there is a little cut in vocational training, two million and a half out of something like twenty-odd million; but, here again, there were cases where it had been abused. Some of those are shown in the reports, and in the report on page 10 you can see three of them specifically: College education for a young man who had lost three toes on his right foot, but who despite his physical handicap and hardship, became the eastern inter-collegiate wrestling champion while being rehabilitated. Spending \$1,443 to rehabilitate a minister whose only disability was squinting and a slight nervousness. Payment for cataract operations and hospitalization for 74- and 80-year-old housewives. I do not know, but you have got to have some kind of integrity in these programs if they are going to continue to command the support of the people.

As to this matter of the agricultural college I do not know what the result will be, but here is the picture: In 1935 an act was passed which said its purpose was, and I will quote exactly: "For the further endowment of agricultural colleges." That has been put in as an emergency item and has dragged on in spite of the fact that we have gotten into a situation where the States ought to be able to take care of the agricultural colleges themselves. There has been no emergency that would prevent the States from doing that sort of thing for many years now. We should get to the point where we approach these things right side up. If we are never going to wake up to our responsibilities, if we do not care anything about keeping down expenses and we are going to lay down on our job and not be fair, I feel rather discouraged about what is going to happen to the United States of America. We can run through the mill and out the window without using our heads and without using our hearts even, just by answering telegram requests for more funds all the time, and you know the folks will ask for them.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and I have been friendly now for about 13 years. I know he does not want to mislead the Congress in any statement he makes. He spoke about a hospital being built at a cost of \$50,000. The record does not show that at all. I think he is referring to one in the State of Pennsylvania. The record will show and the hearings will show, and it was gone into very thoroughly by the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBY] that it was not for the building but for the equipment and the revision of an existing hospital. Perhaps I should say for the modernization of an existing hospital which is the most costly thing in the world. It was



not the building of the hospital that cost \$50,000.

I do not think he wants to leave a false impression with the Congress. There are 1,168 hospitals throughout the country, but only 3 have been closed. The first one was not a grant for construction; it was a grant of \$17,000 or \$18,000 for equipment. That one has closed, but the Federal Government is going to recoup that money. Another one was closed because of the death of an elderly doctor and the remaining young doctor having moved out. They are in the process of securing two doctors to man that small facility in one of the Southern States. The third one has been closed because of a difference of opinion between two States. The hospital is situated almost on the State border. They expect that one to be opened up in a short time.

The hospitals are not being closed. Out of 1,168 only 3 have been affected. Those are the facts. I do not think the gentleman and I disagree on the facts.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. It is time to call attention to the way the thing is operated and it is time to put ourselves upon guard. We have to approach this in a business-like manner. When the committee has appropriated \$50 million out of \$75 million that is not a serious cut and it should not impair any decent operation.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is a very serious cut. It will be remembered that only 3 years ago we not only expanded this program but we increased the authorization from \$75 million to \$150 million without one dissenting vote in the House of Representatives.

Mr. TABER. I think the Members of the House understand their responsibilities a little better now than they did then.

Mr. FOGARTY. Oh, no. I think that because of the record of this program they are going to extend it another 5 years on a nonpartisan basis.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is with some misgivings that I rise this morning. We have a bill before us where every human need, every human want in these United States is involved. First, I should like to take a few minutes to pay tribute to a man who I think is one of the finest living Americans; a man who has done more to preserve the fiscal policy of the United States, if we can say it has been preserved, than any other man in America. I speak of the gentleman from New York, our distinguished colleague, JOHN TABER. It is difficult for the gentleman from New York year after year and year after year to stand here and oppose the increases which you are attempting to make not only in this, but in many appropriation bills.

Consider the bill before you. Under the Department of Labor we have appropriations for these and other agencies: Bureau of Labor Standards, Veterans Employment Rights, Employment Security, Apprenticeship, Unemployment

Compensation for Veterans, Mexican farm-labor program, Employees' Compensation, Labor Statistics, Women's Bureau, and the Wage and Hour Division.

In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare funds for such functions as these are included: American Printing House for the Blind, Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Food and Drug Administration, Freedmen's Hospital, Howard University, Vocational Education, Endowment of Colleges of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Vocational Rehabilitation; and in the Public Health Service such functions as: Venereal diseases, tuberculosis, communicable diseases, engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene, water pollution control, hospital construction, foreign quarantine service, and leprosy hospital in Hawaii:

Also in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the National Institutes of Health, such items as: Cancer, mental health, heart institute, dental health, arthritis, and metabolic disease activities, microbiology, neurology, and blindness. Included also under the health, education, and welfare are funds for St. Elizabeths Hospital, old-age and survivors insurance, grants to States for public assistance, Children's Bureau, grants to States for maternal and child welfare. The items listed affect the educational problems. We have grants for schools, for hospital construction, and various other activities—all of them excellent programs with which no one can quarrel, and toward which everyone is in complete sympathy.

Yet, a few moments ago the House adopted an amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio who said that we now have a know-how cabinet, and yet this House voted to give the new Cabinet officer more money than his predecessor.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the people of America are crying for economy because they are scared to death that our ship of state is going on the rocks. We are facing national bankruptcy and if we are going to increase appropriations instead of decrease them, instead of taking the reductions that have been studied by this subcommittee, I think the American people will call upon us to answer. Our great problem here is maintaining the solvency of the United States, and unless we are willing to take in our own congressional districts the cuts which must be taken in order to balance the budget of the United States, I personally think the Congress of the United States will have been derelict in its duty.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that God will save our Union, but it cannot be saved unless this Congress has the courage of its convictions, the courage to do what the people of America want done to save the United States of America from national bankruptcy. We talk about liberals. Who are the liberals? The men who would turn everything over to the Federal Government, restore us to the days when one man or one group of men could dictate to all other men? Those are not the liberals;

they are the reactionaries, the men who would restore the system of Government from which man fought for generations to free himself. We have had a wonderful heritage in this country. You and I have been privileged to live under it. We have a duty to pass on that heritage to future generations, but we cannot do it unless we maintain the solvency of these United States.

The appropriations listed by purpose, which are called for in this bill are as follows, and the Members will note that they total almost \$2 billion.

#### Department of Labor

Office of the Secretary-----	\$1,250,000
Office of the Solicitor-----	1,350,000
Bureau of Labor Standards----	624,000
Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights-----	300,000
Bureau of Apprenticeship-----	2,700,000
Bureau of Employment Security: Salaries and expenses-----	5,100,000
Grants to States-----	187,300,000
Unemployment compensation for veterans-----	41,000,000
Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm-labor program--	1,250,000
Bureau of Employees' Compensation-----	2,000,000
Bureau of Labor Statistics----	5,250,000
Womens' Bureau-----	300,000
Wage and Hour Division-----	6,000,000

Total, Department of Labor ----- 254,424,000

#### Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

American Printing House for Blind-----	\$175,000
Columbia Institution for the Deaf: Salaries and expenses-----	410,000
Construction of buildings--	-----
Food and Drug Administration-----	5,000,000
Freedmen's Hospital-----	2,750,000
Howard University: Salaries and expenses----	2,240,000
Plans and specifications-----	-----
Construction of buildings-----	20,000
Office of Education: Vocational education-----	16,048,870
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts-----	-----
Salaries and expenses-----	2,500,000
Payments to school districts-----	60,500,000
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Payments to States-----	20,600,000
Salaries and expenses-----	500,000
Public Health Service: Venereal diseases-----	5,000,000
Tuberculosis-----	5,725,000
Assistance to States, general-----	13,250,000
Communicable diseases----	5,000,000
Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene-----	3,000,000
Grants, water pollution control-----	-----
Disease and sanitation investigation and control, Alaska-----	1,082,000
Grants for hospital construction-----	50,000,000
Grants for hospital construction (liquidation of contract authority)-----	19,700,000
Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services-----	750,000
Hospitals and medical care--	32,500,000
Foreign quarantine service--	2,900,000



Department of Health, Education, and  
Welfare—Continued

National Institutes of Health:	
Operating expenses, National Institutes of Health	\$4, 675, 000
National Cancer Institute	17, 887, 000
National mental health activities	10, 895, 000
National Heart Institute	12, 000, 000
Dental health activities	1, 650, 000
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities	5, 000, 000
Microbiology activities	5, 479, 200
Neurology and blindness activities	4, 000, 000
Total, National Institutes of Health	61, 586, 200
Construction of research facilities (liquidation of contract authority)	2, 500, 000
Retired pay of commissioned officers	1, 197, 000
Salaries and expenses (PHS)	2, 900, 000
Revolving and management funds: Service and supply fund	
Total, Public Health Service	207, 090, 200
St. Elizabeths Hospital:	
Salaries and expenses	2, 417, 000
Major repairs	399, 500
Construction, maximum security building	
Social Security Administration:	
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance	(62, 750, 000)
Construction of buildings	(1, 500, 000)
Grants to States for public assistance	1, 340, 000, 000
SE, public assistance	1, 600, 000
Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau	1, 500, 000
Grants to States for maternal and child welfare	30, 000, 000
Office of the Commissioner (appropriation) transfer from OASI trust fund	173, 000 (123, 500)
Operating fund, Bureau of Federal Credit Agencies	250, 000
Office of the Secretary:	
Salaries and expenses	1, 075, 000
OASI	(168, 000)
Office of Field Services	1, 835, 000
OASI	(375, 000)
Office of the General Counsel	350, 000
OASI	(375, 000)
Surplus Property Disposal	450, 000
Total, Health, Education, and Welfare	1, 697, 883, 570
National Labor Relations Board	9, 000, 000
National Mediation Board:	
Salaries and expenses	429, 000
Arbitration and Emergency Boards	138, 000
National Railroad Adjustment Board	497, 000
Railroad Retirement Board	(6, 207, 000)
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service:	
Salaries and expenses	3, 200, 000
Boards of Inquiry	10, 000
Total	1, 965, 581, 570

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word on this

bill H. R. 5246 for labor, health, education, and welfare.

Mr. Chairman, we have been told that the Cabinet of the President is a million-dollar Cabinet, that every member on it has been a most successful operator. I wonder what there is about our thinking that tries to make us feel that the minute we get into the Government we have to stop being Americans, which means having the pioneer spirit, which means creating wealth, spiritual and material. I for one did not run for office with an ax in my hand. I for one did not promise I would chop every tree down on the horizon without replacing it with something else, be it a school, a home, a road, a hospital, or a playground.

It seems to me the spirit of this debate veers toward fear rather than hope for the future.

In the appropriations hearings on Post Office and Treasury, I asked the Treasury to tell us whether our fiscal program was going on the rocks. The answer was that the interest on our national debt was just a little more than 1-something percent, 1.7 percent of our gross national product in 1952—page 61, point 3, 1954 hearings. That's peanuts.

Every member of the Cabinet in ordinary business earned his salt by being able to propel his outfit ahead, and he did not do it with an ax or a tomahawk. He did it with energy and vision and hope for the future.

I do not think anybody in the American economy thinks of standing still or being sterile. As far as the people in my district are concerned, we are not taking per se, this Paris-garter word of a balanced budget, lowered taxes, and the national debt. We want employment, and earnings after employment; that comes from production and purchasing power. You are not going to dig a ditch, build a factory or home, erect a school or church, or provide for the security of this Nation with money laying on the shelf or in a vault. It has to be used. Money is energy; circulated, it creates wealth. So does an educated and gainfully employed people. I for one, and the people of the 13th District of New Jersey, are not going to listen with belief to anyone who tells them that giving the people knowledge and gainful employment and purchasing power is going to put the Government on the rocks. Full steam ahead. Let us not heed those who would drive us to sterility and ruin.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this floor to point out one or two questions involved here which I think might be worthwhile for all of us to think about as we consider this bill.

If the programs involved here are participated in by all the States, and most of them are, is there any evidence in the hearings or elsewhere that you would save money by letting the State take it up and do the same thing, since we have only one people financing it either way? Is there any reason to believe sending the program back to the States would help? Many times there are

reasons to believe you could but how about on these programs? The statement has been made in the report of the committee that these are sound programs, which are in most instances, acknowledged to be good by this committee, which I know is trying to do a good job. They have tried to reduce appropriations but I feel in some instances they missed the mark. They would reduce attention to vocational rehabilitation, when each person so rehabilitated and made self-supporting—which is all he or she wants—actually thereby contributes to the national income. I believe it is a mistake to reduce that program. To reduce funds for vocational agriculture and to eliminate entirely the funds for land-grant colleges with the statement they mean to let the States take them over, does not, I repeat, necessarily mean any saving if the job is to be carried on since the same American people pay for it through State governments as against through the Federal Government? Of course actually no arrangements have been made for the States to take over and that is a sound basis for my opposition to a number of actions of the committee.

I announced yesterday I would offer amendments to restore these funds. I expect to do so unless they are restored by action of the committee. Actually the legislatures in nearly all States will not meet for a year or in some cases it will be 2 years.

It is nice to say, "Let the States take it up," but most of the States cannot do it without there being a vacant interval. I have particular reference to vocational agriculture, and I have reference to the land-grant college item. Certainly with regard to hospitals we have many areas which have done their part and have had to stand by. Should this construction be delayed further? I do not think so.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I noticed in one of the Washington papers the other day that the income-tax payments by the individual States were returned to them in the amount of 6 percent; in other words, for every \$100 that was contributed by the State the Federal Government returned \$6. Is that not correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sure the gentleman saw it in the press, but I would not vouch for the facts, not knowing the newspaper or having any chance to check it myself. I know the gentleman to be a most conscientious, able Member of Congress. Again I say, however, programs you want continued should be turned back to the States only after working out a plan for the States to take over. Actually unless the States can run it better or more economically, there is little to be gained in turning them back.

Actually in the instances I have pointed out there has been no plan worked out for the States to take over as I understand.



The funds here eliminated for land-grant colleges have been counted on in the school budget. I understand in my State about 8 percent of the faculty costs of Alcorn A. and M. College for Negroes are paid through this program. We are making a determined effort to meet our problems but the legislature of my State does not meet until next January, and it will be about a year from this July before they have any chance to replace such funds. The same thing applies perhaps to a lesser degree to all the other land-grant colleges.

There is real need for economy but there are many things in Government that could be reduced rather than these programs. However, I repeat the point I raised a moment ago that merely turning this back to the States, if it is a sound program and should be supported, does not necessarily save any money. Secondly, do not insist that you are not actually reducing the program when it is a fact that the States cannot take over, at least not now. I ask you to keep these questions in mind as the various amendments are debated.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want first of all to start with a sense of humility, and would like to state very specifically my profound appreciation for the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the members of the committee whom I know have worked long and hard to bring before this committee a bill which would be reasonable and effective and do the job as best they know how. My background, Mr. Chairman, has been in the field of education. I want today to mention several items in this bill that cause me considerable concern. The first item is the amount of money which has been recommended for hospital construction. I may be wrong, but yesterday on the floor of the House I asked a question: If the committee's recommendations were carried out, whether that would mean that a university like the one I represent in my district, the University of Florida, would be denied certain funds by means of which they can match an appropriation which has been granted to them by the State legislature to build a great medical school and a hospital in connection therewith to do something about the problems of health that we have in this Nation of ours? The question was answered in the affirmative. In other words, it was said that if this bill were passed, as recommended, the great university I represent would be denied the necessary building funds needed for our contemplated medical school. I may be wrong, but if I am, that impression was gained yesterday in the discussion.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman's statement is absolutely correct, and that is where we were wrong in the committee in cutting these appropriations for hospital construction in that the States in a good many cases have already appropriated their part of the money and they are not going to be able to go ahead. So what happens? That money is lost,

and unless additional money is appropriated either by the State or the Federal Government, it just puts the program back. The gentleman a while ago said that we were standing still. We are not standing still. By this bill we are going backward. And, may I add, I do not agree with the objective stated in the report of sluffing this program solely on the State. The Federal Government itself has a responsibility.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to thank the gentleman. May I proceed a little further and say a word about my philosophy. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], yesterday suggested that I should be consistent. There is no one in the House for whom I have higher esteem than the distinguished gentleman from Ohio. But I believe I am consistent when I point out that we have to do something about the problem of health and the other problems that face this Nation of ours. I am opposed to compulsory health insurance or any type of so-called socialized medical service, if you want to call it that. But I believe in trying to do something to solve the problems of health of the people of this Nation. The Florida State legislature has appropriated \$5 million for a medical center on the campus of the University of Florida at Gainesville, which is in my district. It has been stated that one of the great problems we have in America is to find the doctors' staff and the nursing staff to go ahead in these hospitals and man them once they have been completed. Here we have \$5 million which has been appropriated by the State of Florida, and I know they are planning on some money to help them match that fund in order to get a great medical college with its associated hospital to help our students to go to a medical school to get an opportunity for a medical education. Mr. Chairman, so often we hear the word security in this great Nation of ours. I believe that word has a magic appeal, and it should, but far greater to me than the word security is the word opportunity. I want to see each boy and girl with the ability and the intelligence, the drive, and the initiative who seeks a medical education to have a chance to get that education, and by reason of that same initiative to go out and give the medical service that is so needed in this Nation of ours.

There is another aspect of this bill that concerns me, and that is the program for vocational agriculture. I may be a little biased because I come from a district where the Future Farmers of America mean so much to our people. It is my understanding that program will be cut if the bill in its present form passes. I do not doubt the good intentions of the committee, but I do believe this great organization will be seriously harmed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MATTHEWS was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am very grateful, Mr. Chairman.

I have a deep conviction about this great youth organization. I have seen

these boys and girls in the State of Florida. Their brother organization, the 4-H Club and the sister organization, the Future Homemakers of America. I have seen those groups contribute greatly to agriculture. I have seen the homes that were rude and unpainted and without gardens. During the several years that these boys and girls have had this training, they have changed the appearance of these homes. I have seen first a simple coat of whitewash and then a coat of paint, and then I have seen the gardens and the dairy cows and the progress that has come by this training that the boys and girls have received through this vocational agriculture. I most sincerely believe in it. I believe that the FFA program is giving the future citizens of this great Nation an opportunity, a word that means so much to me.

The third point in this bill that has caused me some concern is the point that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] mentioned; that is, that since 1935, every year \$2,500,000, as I recall, has been appropriated to our land-grant colleges for use in their colleges of agriculture. The State Legislature of Florida has met. They passed a budget for our university and we had counted on \$47,640 of that money from this \$2,500,000 fund to go into our budget. That money is used to develop the great agricultural industry in the State of Florida. Without this money we will be denied \$47,640 for another year. If the Congress wants to say that next year you cannot have it, I will not make any objection to that, but I do not think it is fair at this date to deny us this particular amount of money.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that there is not any question in my mind about economy, but the question is, Where will the fat be cut? I have noticed in the report of the committee certain criticisms of the hospital construction program, for example. It would seem to me that those particular features that are so disadvantageous to the program could be eliminated. I think we ought to cut out all unnecessary fat. I will support any item that tends to do that, but the question is, Where will the fat be cut? I have tried to vote consistently, and I think my record will show that I have voted consistently, for bills previously that have come before the committee that would give us the possibility of real economy. As some Members have already stated in my campaign for Congress I did not talk too much about economy in the necessary domestic programs, as I did point out the fact that most of the money was spent for our great defense effort. If money is to be saved, that is where most of it is going to have to be saved. We must insist on a dollar's worth of defense for each dollar that is spent. I feel that to cut the fat out of a great domestic program is desired. But we must not kill the essential aspects of a proved program that means so much to our people.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am glad the gentleman paid tribute to the gen-



tleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I am sure that all of us share his feeling of appreciation for the efforts of the great chairman of the Appropriations Committee to achieve a balanced budget. It is not in derogation of his service that we make these points as to policy questions in the bill. The gentleman from Florida has well stated the argument that it is false economy to reduce our support of vocational education. As we educate we increase our productive capacity. In my own State the income per capita has quadrupled in the last 15 years, and it has been partly a contribution of the vocational education program in which the Federal Government has shared.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas. Vocational rehabilitation goes right along with that. I did not have an opportunity to say very much about that.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I agree with the gentleman in his statements.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge reversal of the cuts made in the appropriation for the implementation of Public Law 874. We in California have a more than ordinary interest in this appropriation because we have one of the most difficult problems of financing education in the United States because of our extraordinary growth and, as a consequence, Federal impact is an aggravation of an aggravation. The extent of Federal impact is reflected in the fact that California school districts receive the largest share of moneys appropriated under Public Law 874.

In my congressional district I have 3 districts in which the Federal component of contribution exceeds 10 percent. The proposed cut means that one of these districts will lose 28.7 percent of its funds for operation, another 5.9 percent, and another 12.9 percent. By the nature of these districts and the formulas for State assistance the net result will be if this cut obtains that the pupils in these schools will receive an inferior education. In a letter addressed to the Honorable JOHN MOSS, Congressman from California, Frank Wright, associate superintendent of public instruction for the State of California, asserts:

The majority of these districts under a reduction from net entitlement will not be able to continue to provide comparable educational opportunity for federally connected children or other children in the district.

The proposed reduction affects schools in the districts of almost every Congressman from California. It is a 42.9-percent reduction in the total requirement of a program established by this legislative body and amounts to legislation by indirection.

We in California believe in facing school problems head-on and do not approve of methods of cutting school programs to which we have given our pledge.

I am likewise opposed to almost all of the other cuts in the budget of the Department of Health, Education, and

Welfare. The programs of this Department directly touch on the lives of almost all of our citizens in the fields of health, education, nutrition, and protection from fraud.

The cuts in almost every instance represent a greater concern for dollars as compared with human beings. They likewise can be reasonably described as false economy. For example funds available for vocational education and vocational rehabilitation have been radically reduced. Truthfully money spent on these programs is money wisely invested dollarwise because it results in increasing the productivity of our citizens and in many instances removes a worthy citizen from public welfare roles. It is calculated that every dollar spent on vocational rehabilitation returns \$10 to the Federal Government and the benefit in human happiness produced by such expenditure is incalculable.

I am hopeful that every California Member in recognition of our particular stake in appropriations for education, health and vocational training and rehabilitation will support amendments to provide tolerably adequate sums for carrying out the programs I have discussed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: For grants in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49a), for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including, upon the request of any State, the purchase of equipment and the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, for necessary expenses in connection with the operation of employment-office facilities and services in the District of Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684), \$187,300,000, of which \$10 million shall be available only to the extent that the Secretary finds necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from changes in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid over those upon which the State's basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Columbia) was based, which increased costs of administration cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secretary of Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State found to be in compliance with the requirements of the act of June 6, 1933, and, except in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, with the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its unemployment compensation law and of its public-employment offices: *Provided further*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Department of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail matter in connection with the administration of unemployment-compensation systems and employment services by States receiving grants herefrom.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: Page 4, line 23, strike out "\$187,300,000" and insert "\$213,600,000."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to restore to this bill the amount requested by the administration and approved by the Bureau of the Budget, nothing else than that; and the figures in the amendment are exactly in accord with those recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, I make this amendment on two bases: First, keeping faith with the needs of the States, which is not done in the amount which is set forth in this bill; and, second, following the recommendations of the administration is not done in the amount set forth in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has a moral basis, too, because this is a case in which the United States is making, in a sense, a profit; it is not spending the taxpayers' money in the sense that we normally use it here on the floor as coming out of general taxation, for the employers who are covered for unemployment insurance pay into the Federal Treasury three-tenths of 1 percent a year for the purpose of meeting exactly these expenses. In the fiscal year with which we are dealing in this bill the amount of those payments will be \$282,400,000.

The appropriation contained in the bill is \$187,300,000. The amendment calls for \$213,600,000 and is, therefore, still far less than the amount which covered employers will pay into the Treasury. So we are dealing only with part of the excess which will go into the Federal Government on this transaction.

Why do I say we are not keeping faith with the needs of States? The States get this money in order to maintain two kinds of service: First, to administer unemployment insurance claims; and, second, to try to find employment for people who are unemployed.

I was prompted to offer this amendment by information received from the department of labor of my own State, New York. The Honorable Edward Corsi who heads that department is a devoted and outstandingly able and conservative official and administrator. His executive director of the division of placement and unemployment insurance advises me in text, that the administration of the unemployment insurance program in the State of New York will absolutely drop down to the point where he will not be able to effectively audit the claims and will not be able to do the needed job to find employment for those drawing insurance payments, if this cut which the committee proposes is put into effect. He points out that in 1948 when exactly the same thing happened we had a real scandal in New York—to cite one instance, of an individual who took advantage of the program to sun himself on the sands of Florida—because the State could not have an adequate checkup on these people who were receiving unemployment insurance because of just such



shortages of funds allowed by the Federal Government for needed staff.

I think the justification for this amendment is organic even in the statement of the committee itself, and I call the attention of the Committee of the Whole to the statement of the committee in justification on page 4 of its report where the following statement appears:

The amount recommended is based on the assumption of workload continuing at the 1953 level, but with the \$10 million contingency fund being available to the extent necessary for additional workload, if any, resulting from changes in State laws, increased unemployment or other factors.

You would think, therefore, that the committee ought to allow exactly what was allowed in 1953, but they did not. In 1953, \$197 million will have been spent for this activity and that includes the \$10 million reserve and even a deficiency appropriation. Yet the committee is giving this activity a total of only \$187,300,000.

The reason for the difference between my amendment and \$197 million which is being spent in 1953 is that many of the States have mandatory increases of salaries of State employees running the program. So the amount which the Federal Government recommended and the amount the Bureau of the Budget approved is to carry the same workload, except taking into account the mandatory salary increases for the people who work on the program in the various States.

I am advised that the program has got to be cut in New York in terms of the people who work on it to the tune of about 16 percent if this cut goes through. The representation by the New York Commissioner of Labor, who, as I say is a conservative administrator, and a splendid State official, is to the effect this will disable that agency from doing the effective job he has to do about these unemployment insurance funds.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Along the same lines the gentleman has stated about his commissioner of labor, I have here a letter from the director of employment security of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Of course, we all know that unfortunately Massachusetts now has a Republican administration. The letter is identically the same and along the line the gentleman has stated as representing the views of the commissioner of labor of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JAVITS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the other point about this whole thing is that we are really kidding ourselves because the record shows that supplementary appropriations have had to be asked for in this very situation and have had to be granted. The whole unemployment insurance system is dependent for its administration upon what the Federal

Government allows out of what covered employees themselves pay in.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. This is one of those instances where improper or insufficient administration would permit more chiselers to remain on the unemployment rolls?

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly what New York's Department of Labor advises. We are fooling ourselves if we cut in this way. The needed amount is really not out of the Federal Government's general tax revenues, it is out of the funds the covered employees themselves pay in. We are jeopardizing security of the whole program and inviting a series of scandals which we will be the first to inveigh against, condemn, and deplore. I am calling to the attention of the Committee of the Whole today this situation which will exist if we let it stand as it is in this bill and urge therefore the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the committee's attention to the language on this item in the report:

The bill includes \$187,300,000, a reduction of \$30,700,000 from the request and \$9,810,000 from the amount appropriated for 1953. The reduction is slightly larger than is apparent since the recommended amount contains a \$10 million contingency fund whereas the latest informal estimate of the Department is that practically all of the \$197,110,000 appropriated for 1953 will be expended. The amount recommended is based on the assumption of workload continuing at the 1953 level, but with the \$10 million contingency fund being available to the extent necessary for additional workload, if any, resulting from changes in State laws, increased unemployment or other factors.

If I recall correctly, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] said something about a 16-percent cut. Even if you do not take into consideration the \$10 million contingency fund, it will be about a 10-percent cut. If you add the \$10 million that is allowed in the contingency fund, it will be approximately 5 percent.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I pointed out that practically all States had mandatory salary increases for their employees. Everybody knows, therefore, that when you have to pay people more money, and we are all doing that even in our own businesses, you are going to have less employees for the money you have.

And I read from a letter of Commissioner Cozzi in which he says in New York City it represents a 16-percent reduction and he says he just cannot do the job.

Mr. BUSBEY. Is that in New York State?

Mr. JAVITS. That is right.

Mr. BUSBEY. I misunderstood; I thought you were referring to the total. Your commissioner mentioned these

people sunning themselves in Florida. It seems to me that the State of New York should check these people before they hand out their checks. They evidently hand out their checks and then check them after that?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think the gentleman heard me at all. I said in 1948 when you did just what you are doing in this bill now, that was the result. That is not the situation now in the State of New York. The situation there, I think, is the tightest of any State in the Union, but if you pass this bill as it is, you will get it again.

Mr. BUSBEY. I hope that the gentleman knows what he is talking about. The amount of the appropriation has increased every year since 1948. The amount provided in this bill is more than was appropriated in 1952, or any year prior to that. It is an increase of over 40 percent above the 1948 appropriation. We purposely provided this \$10 million contingency fund so that if anything did happen to increase workloads, they would have the contingency fund to draw on. The gentleman knows as well as I do that, if this is not enough—and I think it is enough money to operate the program efficiently and economically—they will request a supplemental appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to be disagreeing with my chairman again. I think the gentleman from New York has stated the facts correctly. I do not believe there is an employment security administrator in any State in the Union who will tell you today that this is enough money for them to operate on in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think that is a correct statement. All of us, if we were in that position, would argue that we did not have enough. That is the custom when they are getting funds from the Federal Government.

Mr. FOGARTY. No; that is not a true statement. These are not Federal funds, let us not forget that point. These funds are paid in by the employer, and in some cases the employee, into a trust fund in the Treasury of the United States, and the Treasury is taking in about \$60,000,000 a year more than it is paying out. It is not a drain on the Federal Treasury at all; it is coming out of this fund that has been paid into by the employer, and in some cases, the employee. It is not a drain on the administration or the Federal Treasury. This is something that belongs to them. It does not belong to the Federal Government; it belongs to those people who paid into the fund, and we are taking into the Treasury an average of \$60,000,000 a year more than we are paying out. Why some of these administrators are sad about this now is that it is going to upset the entire operation of their offices. It is going



to bring on cases where they cannot show economy. They need the personnel, because when a man or woman comes in and makes an appeal for unemployment compensation, they have got to be investigated. You take this personnel away from them and they cannot be investigated, and the scandals that the gentleman from New York referred to will come up again, and they will not be responsible. It will be the Congress of the United States that will be responsible then if we allow this cut to stand. This is not a real cut. As the gentleman from Illinois just said, they know that they can come back with a supplemental bill. He is on the one hand against agencies coming in for supplementals and on the other hand he is suggesting to them that they can come back the first of January for a supplemental request for this agency. Let us not forget the facts. This is not an appropriation out of the Federal Treasury at all. It is money in this fund that is paid in by the employers of the country, and we are keeping \$60 million more than we are paying out at the present time. Everyone knows that a cut like this is going to cripple the services in the States. It is not going to be economy in the States. There is no Federal Administrator, be he Democrat or Republican, who will agree with the action taken by this committee. I know that to be a fact, and let us not kid each other about it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. After all, irrespective of what he may say in regard to these tax payments, they are paid into the Federal Treasury, and any funds we appropriate in this bill are appropriated out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is positively right, but it is not a drain on the taxpayers of this country. That is what I am trying to say. The gentleman has to admit that is correct.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am fundamentally opposed to supplemental bills. In the opinion of the committee, this appropriation will give them ample funds. The Department not only can, but will, resort to supplemental appropriation requests if the workload increases to the extent that it cannot be handled with the contingency fund that is provided.

I wish to make it clear again that this three-tenths-of-1-percent tax is paid into the general funds of the Treasury, and this appropriation is made from the Treasury. The taxpayers of the United States will be \$26,300,000 better off if this amendment is defeated.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is an additional fact that you are requesting them to come back with a supplemental request. As to the contingency fund the gentleman spoke about, \$10 million, it is true we made this contingency fund available about 6 years ago in this bill to take care of unexpected increases in workloads and State salaries. Am I not correct that we go further and make a paper cut in this report, because do we not say to the States in that report—I

cannot point it out directly—that we are now making the States assume the responsibility of any increases in salaries, which the Federal Government has always paid for before?

Mr. BUSBEY. That is a correct statement with regard to the fact that we do not allow for an increase in this appropriation, at a later date, on the basis of an increase in State salaries.

Mr. FOGARTY. So it means a further cut than shown in the actual figures, because we are telling the States now, "If you want to raise the salaries of these employees you do it yourself," even though the Federal Government is making \$60 million a year profit on these funds at the present time.

A 15 percent reduction in the 1954 appropriation request for grants to the States for the administration of employment security will require that consideration be given to the elimination and curtailment of the following activities:

It would mean curtailment of fraud activities and employer tax auditing in the unemployment insurance functions. It would also necessitate a greatly reduced quality of work in other unemployment insurance activities. The system is already under heavy attack for the amount of improper payments which occur even with the best efforts to control them. This type of cut would render the States helpless in trying to improve and perfect the system.

A 15 percent cut in State grants would have its most immediate and serious effect on the placement of unemployment insurance claimants by the local offices of the State improvement services. The work test and the placement of claimants is essential to the protection of the unemployment insurance trust fund, and the reserve accounts of covered employers. A 15 percent cut in this area of activity would certainly be false economy, as the losses resulting would far exceed the apparent budgetary savings. Placement service represents 54 percent of the direct workload of the Employment Service offices throughout the country. Any overall substantial reduction would inevitably, therefore, cut sharply into this constructive service. It would be little economy to bear the fixed overhead for rents and premises, legally required work registration—for unemployment insurance claimants—and other placement-supporting activities and curtail the "end result" placement service. If levied against any of the direct placement-supporting workloads, the 15-percent cut would reduce the number of new work applications by almost 60 percent. Placement activity would be wholly stopped if this were to take place. A reduction of this size in direct workload, if applied against counseling and testing, would to all intents and purposes eliminate these placement-supporting services entirely.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we reduced this appropriation due to the fact that we felt this fund could be efficiently administered for the amount we provide in the bill.

Here is a point I think should be brought out, that when we reduce the administrative cost for this fund we save money for the people who benefit from this fund, and the action of the committee benefit the employers who pay into this fund. Certainly the department can put administrative practices into effect which will save this amount.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry, I do not quite follow how the gentleman is saving money. In the first place, employees do not pay into it, it is just employers. In the second place, they pay it just the same, no matter what is appropriated in this bill. They paid \$284 million into this fund. That is three-tenths of 1 percent. I do not see where they get any saving.

Mr. JENSEN. We are reducing the administrative cost.

Mr. JAVITS. You are reducing it at the expense of the administration of their own funds.

Mr. JENSEN. All right, the committee is satisfied that this fund can be properly administered with the amount we have left in the bill for administrative purposes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as the Congress can see, this comes down to the question of supporting the administration. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has faced us fairly with the question as to how this fund shall be administered saying, in their judgment, for the coming year it can be administered better. The administration has come up to Congress with a justification for the amount needed in this program for the coming year assuring that on the method that they will administer the funds, it will be done well under the Eisenhower administration. Secondly, there is real need for these funds because it has been justified by the Labor Department for this purpose. The Department has the administrative responsibility. That Department has the confidence of President Eisenhower. So I ask the Congress to give this new Cabinet officer the power to demonstrate that responsibility, and if it is wrong, let us be the first ones here later to come in and criticize.

This question depends on an overall problem of justification. When the subcommittee cuts the justification for administering unemployment compensation by \$30,700,000, the subcommittee must have some specific reasons for that reduction of the request and justification of the Department. I have not heard yet any complete delineation of the various categories of the \$30,700,000 that is to be reduced. That should be set out in detail, and unless the committee can supply that point by point and amount by amount, making up that \$30,700,000, my position is that the cut should not be adopted by the House.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The gentleman who is now addressing us is out of order since he is talking about an amendment which



relates to the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, and we are discussing a division in the Labor Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. BUSBEY. If the gentleman had yielded to me earlier, I was going to tell him we had not reached the Department of Health, Education, and Labor.

Mr. FULTON. That is completely correct, but this has been justified to the committee by the Department of Labor. The overall policy I wanted to speak about, was whether we in this House have confidence in the Eisenhower departments that are coming up with justifications and requests for administration of these Departments during the present fiscal year. When they come up with these various justifications that they have made, how will Congress look on such requests as a general principle? Will we adopt a principle of appropriation reduction by committees of Congress before the committee has had a chance to see that the new Departments are in operation, and deny the new administration a chance to set up efficient management under its reduced budget figures? We should not adopt such a principle.

In conclusion, as to the method of approaching the cuts requested in the Labor Department and Mrs. Hobby's department, when the House approaches what they are doing, let them come here on their original appropriation bills and give full justification and then we should listen to the committee and see what are the specific details of how each should be cut. Congress should not in advance say it is going to cut down the administration requests, or that these departments have not succeeded because they have not had an adequate chance to perform. If the committee says the departments have not justified the requests properly, then require the Subcommittee on Appropriations to give the House specific details of the cut. I do not think that has been done in this instance. I believe that a vote to reduce at this time the budget of the Department of Labor will be an expression of no confidence in the justification at this particular point. I believe the Eisenhower administration is responsible and we must accept their word at this time, to give the new department heads an opportunity to set up the departments properly under the new administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this item is directly out of the Federal Treasury. It represents grants to States to administer this unemployment insurance. Frankly, the collection of that tax and the distribution of the fund by grants-in-aid is not the business way to handle the job. The collection of the tax for that purpose ought to be made by the States, in my opinion. But that is not the setup. When you administer a program like that in the States, without a sense of responsibility that goes to the State ad-

ministrators and the State legislators, of the situation that is created when they have to levy a tax, you do not get that combing down of the appropriations and that control over them which you get if they have to raise the money themselves and pay it out of the funds that they have raised.

The committee was asked for \$16 million more than they had available in the Labor Department for allocation to the States. The committee thought that they could get along with \$187 million instead of \$197 million, and there was no good justification submitted for an increase up to \$213 million. Under those circumstances, why should we go over the head of the committee and increase this item by \$30 million?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, as we read this bill we see operating much of what is involved in so-called grants-in-aid. I think it is about time that a lot of us realized that the phrase "grants-in-aid" is deceptive, because there is no money in the Federal Treasury to send back to the States that is not first found in 1 of the 48 States. Out in Indiana and in a lot of other States we find that by the time that money goes to Washington and is sent back the dollar shrinks.

I was amazed to hear the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] say a moment ago that if you turned such a program back to the States it would cost just as much to run as though you collected the money in Mississippi, brought it to Washington and sent it back to Mississippi. I sat in on the meeting at the White House when four governors representing the governors' conference were present and said that reliable estimates indicate that as these programs were turned back to the States for administration, the greater feeling of responsibility resulted in the work being carried on in a better fashion with at least a 25-percent saving.

I agree with the gentleman that all of these things are fine; certainly they are fine.

As far as supporting the administration is concerned, I support the administration; but I do not think it is breaking ranks with the administration if the Congress of the United States in the exercise of its responsibility with regard to appropriations feels on occasion that maybe the estimates from our own administration are still a little too high. So, as far as I am concerned, I want to say again, let us not deceive ourselves. There is a demand in the country that Federal spending be cut back; certainly, it should not be done recklessly, but I think we have got to find ways and means to get along with a little less and try to do the job with a little less. If we do not do that, then again may I say you never will get taxes down out of the stratosphere and you never will give our people the tax relief they ought to have, nor will you be able to carry on with the security of the country mili-

tarily without losing the very freedoms at home for which we fight abroad.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] is recognized.

(Mr. SHELLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, the comment that has been made in reference to the so-called economy program, that there is a plea for reduction of taxes, is probably very true. But a reduction proposed by the committee in this item is not going to give to the general taxpayer of this country any reduction in the tax he pays to the Federal Government. The money that goes into this fund is set by law and is paid by the employer and goes into this designated fund.

In reducing the administrative amount which is actually spent in the State agencies in the respective States what you are doing is cutting down the staff for sound administration and allowing claims to build up which in turn will create a very unhealthy situation on the part of those who are seeking their employment benefits or making application for the assistance which is set by the law of this country and the laws of the various States. It is an age-old fight. The States over the years have needed additional money for administrative purposes, and right today a great many of the States are in here supporting requests for additional money for investigative and prosecution purposes where they think there is fraud; and we find the requests of the States supported by the departmental secretaries who deal with the situation. Here we have a recommendation from the committee without any basic explanation as to why we should accept the recommendation. I think the pending amendment is worthwhile and should be supported because whenever we reduce the administrative expense without explanation, whether it be by State legislature or in the national Congress, it is my observation that the result of such action is one by which the basic law is hampered or crippled and cannot be effectively administered. In this case, a case where people do not argue against the soundness of the fundamental law in giving assistance to people over a period of unemployment, I am sure no one would want to reduce the administrative amount, thereby creating a situation where a backlog of cases is built up, claims cannot be processed, investigations cannot be made. This produces a situation whereby the law is nullified by lack of funds. To reduce the administrative expense fund as recommended here would actually bring about that result. The States and the secretaries in charge have asked for an amount that



will only allow them to give proper administration.

Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment should be supported.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman correctly points out that this three-tenths of 1 percent does not come from the general tax fund. It is a set aside fund and the Federal Government is in fact trustee of the fund.

Mr. SHELLEY. That is right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If this fund is paid directly to the States, then it would be a different proposition, because the States then would have adequate money to handle their own funds; but under the basic Federal law we become the trustees of this particular fund. Now to deny the States part of this fund which we act as trustee for, is, in my opinion, a violation of trust. To a certain extent we have obligated ourselves by custom to give these funds back to the States in order to administer this overall program. The fact that we are denying it to them is in effect denying to them money that is collected from individuals for that very purpose.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

(Mr. MOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, there is no economy in the proposal to reduce this figure below the amount requested by the Department. This money is a trust fund to provide for the administration of this program.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. This is not a trust fund. It is a tax levied by the Federal Government and paid into the Treasury.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. With the express understanding it is to be used for administrative purposes in connection with carrying out that part of the organic law to which it applies.

Mr. MOSS. I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The money paid into the Treasury is put there for a specific purpose. It is collected as part of the contributions to the unemployment insurance fund. These collections from the employees and employers are held in trust by the Federal Government and paid out to relieve the economic burden on persons in covered jobs when they are out of work. The fact that part of the money collected is used for administration of the unemployment aid program does not make the entire fund or any part of it any less of a trust fund.

Mr. McCORMACK. We all know it belongs to the States.

Mr. MOSS. I have always regarded it as a trust fund to provide for the payment of administrative overhead to the respective States. I know the effect on the State of California of the cuts of 1948. I know that no economy resulted from those cuts. I know that we lost many valued and experienced employees from the unemployment-insurance office staff in Sacramento because we could no longer pay them. I know that no economy resulted when we were less able to do an adequate job of investigating the applicants for unemployment insurance. I know that no economy resulted when we were unable to find jobs for unemployed people as quickly as we should have and thereby reduce the total payments from the unemployment-insurance fund.

I know that in my State of California we have long regarded this as a program of feast or famine. We have been consistently denied a sufficient appropriation to give this program the type of administration we should, whether you apply the yardstick of Government administration or the yardstick of business administration. You do not save by reducing administrative effectiveness. You are violating the promises made by the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle to the American people last fall. They promised the people they would increase the administrative effectiveness at all levels of this Government.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I am going to ask the gentleman if he knows that the California Legislature ordered an investigation of this fund, and whether he knows that the report resulting from that investigation stated that, during the calendar year 1952, 17 percent of all claims received were fraudulent or improper?

Mr. MOSS. I thank the gentleman for bringing that point out. I was just going to. You can improve the administrative effectiveness if you give California the staff to do the job. The investigation in California showed that there were abuses. We know that most of them stem from an inadequate staff to do the job that we are charged to do by law. The only way to provide an adequate staff is to provide adequate funds.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to ask the gentleman how Secretary of Labor Durkin is going to get rid of some of these administrators that have been handling this job unless we cut some appropriations out of their administrative cost.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman knows that is at the State level, and the point he brings out was very effectively covered in the report of the investigation by the California State Legislature to which he referred. The report recommended certain administrative changes which must be handled at the State level. A drastic cut in administrative funds in the hope the cut will permit Secretary Durkin to get rid of some of his employees will not help the administration of the unemployment insurance program at the State level.

Since the gentleman from Iowa has referred to the investigation of the un-

employment insurance program administration in California, it would be well to look at some of the recommendations of the California State Legislature committee which conducted the investigation. They estimated 17 percent of the 1952 payments were either fraudulent or improper and they recommended eight administrative changes to prevent future fraudulent payments.

The first recommendation was that there be an effort to "obtain additional funds for the express purpose of combating fraudulent or improper claims payments." Of the other 7 recommended changes in administrative procedure, 4 called for changes in office procedure, and the other 3 suggested moves which would mean a more expensive administration of the program. The State investigating committee suggested a post-audit of claims payments; a program of more frequent interviews of claimants, and the employment of outside consultants to study the operation of the unemployment program in California. As the gentleman from Iowa said, the California State Legislature found a large percentage of fraudulent benefit payments, but he failed to add that the recommended remedy was to increase, not decrease, funds for administration of the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Javits].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Javits) there were—ayes 72, noes 76.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BUSHEY and Mr. JAVITS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 109, noes 114.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program: For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under the act of July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78), including temporary employment of persons without regard to the civil service laws, \$1,250,000.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday during the general debate, I was absent from the floor because we were having a meeting of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, and the marking up of that bill. Consequently, I missed most of the debate, but of course the ranking member on this side, the gentleman from Rhode Island and a veteran on this committee, was here and he spoke my sentiments. I take this time now to say just a few words in general about the bill.

On this bill, I have gone along with the committee on a good many of the cuts which were made—cuts that hurt, because I felt there was need to cut on many of these appropriations in the effort to balance the budget. But I have not gone along with all of the cuts which were made. Particularly, I have not gone along and have protested in com-



mittee and out of committee, the cuts which were made on hospital construction, the cuts which were made on the appropriations for control of tuberculosis, vocational education, and several other items. I particularly do not go along with the committee on some of the statements that are made in this report. For example, as to this very appropriation which has just been read by the Clerk, the report says with respect to salaries and expenses for the Mexican farm labor program:

The committee had serious misgivings about this program, which guarantees to foreign agricultural workers coming into this country, many things such as medical care for sickness or injury incurred on the jobs.

I do not go along with any of those statements in this committee's report, which we of course did not see until it was printed. Then the report further says: "However in view of the recent approval of an extension of the basic legislation by a large majority of the House of Representatives, the committee is recommending a continuation of appropriations." This statement might be misleading for, contrary to inference which may be gained from this statement in the report—the committee allowed—and I am going to ask the chairman if this is not correct, the committee allowed this appropriation only for the first half of the fiscal year because this program of Mexican labor ends on December 31, and the Department asked for money only to wind up the program by December 31. The committee discussed only the funds needed up to that time, and recommended the appropriation of only enough money on the old program to last until December 31. If the program is extended by enacting into law of the bill which has already passed the House, necessarily they will have to have more appropriations. May I ask the chairman if that is not correct?

Mr. BUSBEY. I think that is a true statement which has been made by the gentleman from New Mexico when he says that we considered this for 6 months only because the program expires on December 31 of this year.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, before resuming my seat I want to congratulate and compliment the chairman of this committee the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the leadership of the House, for the practice which has been established this year of bringing to the floor these appropriation bills the week after they have been reported by the committee, instead of on the day following the report. I think that is an excellent practice, because it gives the membership of the House an opportunity to find out what is in these bills before they come to the floor. I think it is a very salutary practice. I hope in 1955 when the Democrats come back into power we shall continue to follow that practice. It is very salutary, as I said, and it is very considerate of the membership of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

First, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from New Mexico for conceding the 1954 election. I think, however, he is conceding it the wrong way.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time because what I have to say applies more to the succeeding sections of the bill and is general in nature.

Mr. Chairman, President Eisenhower, in the state of the Union message, February 2, 1953, discussed his plans for the Department of Labor in the following words:

The administration intends to strengthen and to improve the services which the Department of Labor can render to the worker and to the whole national community. This Department was created, just 40 years ago, to serve the entire Nation. It must aid, for example, employers and employees alike in improving training programs that will develop skilled and competent workers. It must enjoy the confidence and respect of labor and industry in order to play a significant role in the planning of America's economic future.

The President chose as Secretary of Labor one of the most respected leaders in the American labor movement—a man whose probity and ability have never been questioned. Martin Durkin took the job of carrying out in his Department the jobs entrusted to it by Congress in a wide variety of economic and social fields. Many of these jobs are in protection of the unorganized workers of this country, since Mr. Durkin's fellow union members, through collective bargaining, are quite well equipped and willing to take care of their own problems with their employers, and without Government intervention. That is the way it should be in a free country.

But the administration and enforcement of the laws which we have placed in the Department of Labor call for tools and men to handle them.

Secretary Durkin himself showed his willingness to economize by cutting back his Department's budget, under the Truman estimates, by more than \$10 million. He voluntarily offered this to Congress—a cut of more than 4 percent.

But now the Appropriations Committee has gone far beyond, and is cutting through the flesh into the bone, to a point where there is grave doubt that the Department will be able to do its work.

Instead of the more than 4-percent cut by the Secretary of Labor, the committee has cut about 15 percent on the overall budget, and it has cut the administrative or payroll budget of Mr. Durkin's Department by about 18 percent.

This administrative budget amounted to only 9 percent, 9 cents out of every dollar, of the Labor Department money, the other 91 cents being used for grants to the States, for payment of compensation to workers injured in the Federal service, and for unemployment insurance for veterans.

The Department has only 5,900 employees, and is by far the smallest Cabinet agency. Yet, under the House committee cut, Secretary Durkin is being

forced to issue layoff and dismissal notices to more than 600 people, over 10 percent of his force, next week. And this is being done after the Department employment had been reduced by more than 1,000 during the last 10 or 12 months.

This Department operates in a field of human relations and services rendered to people under laws passed by Congress, attempting to help people in situations where they cannot help themselves. This applies to the exploited child worker. It also applies to businessmen who use statistics which no businessman or corporation could get for itself.

It appears on the record that the committee has gone too far, and has cut to a point where these acts of Congress cannot be efficiently carried out, where the constructive efforts of the Department to strengthen the national economy will actually be hampered.

Specifically, the heaviest cuts apply to the Department's functions for the promotion of skilled training through apprenticeship, enforcement of the wage-hour and child-labor laws, and development of job-safety training and programs.

The House committee has specifically eliminated all of the Labor Department's budget items for carrying on the defense activities which up to now have been paid for under national-defense appropriation bills. Now, this seems to me to be a very dangerous procedure. The defense emergency continues, and we are appropriating for defense operations to other agencies. The Labor Department's work in statistics, in safety programs for defense plants, and in training, has been recognized in two wars and in the current defense program, as vital to building our defenses.

Yet the committee has eliminated every cent for these defense activities. This confronts Secretary Durkin with the impossible choice of eliminating all these defense activities, or eliminating other vital, regular activities upon which business and industry, management, and labor both look to the Department to supply.

Mr. Chairman, I think this committee report falls short of President Eisenhower's recommendation in his state of the Union message of February 2, 1953, which I applauded then and applaud now, which I supported then and support now. Millions of workers who voted Republican last November are entitled to the services of a strong, efficient Department of Labor under a competent, strong, efficient Republican administration.

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely regret the action of the committee in not approving the Javits amendment. There are some other elements of this labor situation that I think it would be well for my colleagues to know about. For instance, I sat through 2½ months of hearings



by the Committee on Labor, and one-third of the 100 or more witnesses who appeared before that committee expressed regret at the delay on the part of the National Labor Relations Board in processing both appeals by labor and appeals by industry. There were instances in which there had been delay of as much as 3 years. It was stated particularly by the majority members of the Committee on Labor that what was needed was more and better examiners and more and better field men so as to process those cases.

Imagine my surprise when I found in this bill that the National Labor Relations Board is being reduced by approximately \$800,000; that the National Mediation Board is being reduced, that the Mediation and Conciliation Service is being reduced. The members of the committee applauded the excellent job that was done by the Mediation Service under the late Cyrus Ching and said they thought a great deal of work being done by the Labor Board could very well be done by the Mediation Service. It was very general expressed by both labor and industry that something should be done to improve the facilities and the record being made by the National Labor Relations Board, so I am surprised that some Members of the majority here do not complain about the cut in these particular items.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Women's Bureau*

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the act of June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of reports and material for informational exhibits, \$300,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 9, line 9, strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$360,000."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, this matter was discussed on the floor of the House yesterday and I am sure the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] wants it made clear that this amendment was originally to have been offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON]. Unfortunately she has been temporarily called off the floor. The Clerk, therefore, had to report the amendment as having been offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. I explained yesterday why I would support the amendment, and wish to say now that the committee agrees to it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it was my intention to offer an amendment to this section because, believing as I do that furthering the welfare of its citizens is one of the prime reasons for Government, I am deeply concerned with the proposed cut in the Labor Department budget which deprive the Women's Bureau of roughly one-sixth of its present appropriation.

Today our country needs the best services of all its workers, men and women, to keep our defense program and our civilian economy at the high level required, and this state of affairs is likely to be with us for a long time. When one in every three workers is a woman and when over half of those working women are married women living with their families—working to help maintain the family standard of living, working also in response to pleas that trained teachers, trained nurses, trained social workers, and trained operatives in plants are serving the public interest as well as their own economic needs—it is little enough for the Government to provide \$360,000 to supply all of us with information that would provide a basis of knowledge and understanding of those things which this Congress has authorized the Women's Bureau to do in the act establishing it, namely, "to promote the welfare of wage-earning women, improve their working conditions, increase their efficiency, and advance their opportunities for profitable employment." As I understand the situation, if the cut to the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor were to stand, it would mean taking away 9 or 10 jobs out of 58, and that would mean that they would have to give up essential parts of the program. I think most of you know that this is the only place in Government where any policy with regard to the economic interest of women can be formed.

I am clear in my own mind as to the value of this investment. I am morally certain that not only the women of my own constituency but women throughout the United States would share my conviction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Wage and Hour Division*

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for performing the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and the act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Division, \$6 million.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 9, line 20, strike out "\$6 million" and insert "\$7,339,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because this is one of the agencies in the Department of Labor that has received the stiffest cut.

Let me point out that the Wage and Hour Division has, over the past several years, had its staff cut back each year. The budgeted positions of the Division have been reduced from a high of 2,417 to their request for 1954 of 1,318, a decrease of almost 50 percent.

The Fair Labor Standards Act, which the Division administers, is complex and ever changing as a result of court decisions and the development of regulations and interpretations. As new regulations are developed or interpretative questions resolved, it is necessary for the Division to give advice and counsel to employers in affected industries so that they may conform their practices to the requirements of the law.

The need for keeping employers advised as to their responsibilities under the law is obvious. An employer may violate the law either willfully or unwittingly. In either event, he is accruing liabilities in the form of back wages legally due his employees and is subject to suit under section 16 of the act for double the amount found to be due. Then, too, there is the element of equal treatment under the law. An employer who violates the law by not paying wages properly obtains a competitive advantage over the employer who is conducting his business in full compliance with the provisions of the law.

The manner in which employers are kept advised by the Division of their responsibilities under the law are many and varied. No informational or educational media is overlooked. The most effective, however, is the direct advice and counsel that is given to individual employers and groups of employers through the Division's regional and field offices. These offices are strategically located at points throughout the country, where there are the greatest concentrations of industry, to service the public and to let employers know how the law affects them and their business. It is only through this method that there can be any assurance of reasonable compliance with the complex provisions of the law administered by the Division.

A reduction from the revised budget estimate would result in the necessity for closing a number of regional and field offices throughout the country and for reducing staff in the national office. Employers and employees throughout the country would be inconvenienced by the closing of offices necessitating travel to more distant points to seek advice and counsel on problems affecting them. The effect of the reduction would immediately weaken the effective program that has been carried out by the Division through its field organization to educate and inform the employers and employees of the country of their responsibilities and rights under the law. It is only through this approach to the administration of this law that it has been possible to obtain reasonable compliance with the inspection staff that is now provided.

A reduction in the budget will also result in decreasing the already limited number of investigations the Division can make. Any further curtailment of investigations will be detrimental to both employers and employees. Let us not cut this staff so they will be unable to help prevent employers from being sued for double damages by their employees.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, several of the cuts in the budget for the Department of Labor are, in my opinion, false



economy. While some of the cuts are relatively small in the amount of dollars involved, I believe that the damage that these cuts will incur is great. A good example is the cut in the appropriation for the enforcement of the Federal wage and hour law. The Fogarty amendment proposes to restore the cut in the appropriation which the committee made in the recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget. We have on the statute books the Federal wage and hour law. Both political parties have endorsed this law. If this law is to have the effect for which it was intended, it must be enforced. The appropriation which pays for the enforcement of this law and for the education of the people, both employees and employers, as to the provisions of this law, has been cut approximately 25 percent. During this last year when the appropriation of this enforcement agency was 25 percent more than was proposed for next year, the agency was running far behind in its work. As I stated before, the work of this Bureau consists of more than just the enforcement of the law. It consists also of educating the people as to the provisions of the law. If this cut is carried through it will decrease the effectiveness of this Bureau by at least 25 percent, which will mean a reduction in the Bureau where both the employees and employers can get information regarding the law and its administration. The 85 regional offices will be cut by approximately 25 percent.

There are other cuts in the budget for the Labor Department which, I believe, will be injurious to our general economy; but I will further mention only one of these.

A striking example is a cut in the appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Standards, which has been reduced from approximately \$900,000 to \$624,000, a cut of \$374,000 below the request of the Bureau of the Budget. I have never heard anyone criticize the job that is being done by the Bureau of Labor Standards. The efficient operation of that Bureau has saved thousands of laborers from death and injury. Yet, funds for that Bureau are being cut approximately 30 percent.

The job of curbing the killing and maiming of American workers was tremendous last year. More than 2 million workers were injured. There were three times as many people killed last year in on-the-job accidents as were killed in combat in Korea. Of those injured, 84,000 suffered permanent disability. Millions of man-days of work were lost due to these injuries.

The Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Standards promotes safe working conditions throughout industry. The National Safety Council's report shows the magnificent work that the Bureau of Labor Standards has accomplished. After careful study, this Bureau cut its budget requests as low as it could and still properly carry out the functions assigned it under the law. The Budget Bureau then investigated this budget and arrived at the figure of approximately \$900,000. Yet, the Committee has cut this amount 30 percent, which can, in my opinion, only mean that the effi-

ciency of the Bureau in preventing accidents will be correspondingly reduced.

I also want to point out that the revised budgets for these departments were worked out by each department at the request of President Eisenhower, after he was inaugurated. The Bureau of the Budget also reinvestigated these requests on the order of President Eisenhower. I am deeply interested in sound economy, but I am also aware that these departments of the Government are dependent upon these appropriations to carry out the functions assigned to them under the law. If Congress believes that these functions should be curtailed, it should curtail them by legislation, and not by strangling the Departments, such as the Labor Department, by denying the necessary funds to carry out the job delegated them by the Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it is indeed unfortunate that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to reduce the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor \$1,639,000. Of course this is only one of the unreasonable cuts in the various divisions of the Department of Labor. A major reduction of this kind in the Wage and Hour Division means that Members of Congress, industrial management, labor organizations and numerous other groups throughout the country will be denied the services which this large Department renders to the people. This reduction will greatly interfere with the operations of the minimum wage laws, the Walsh-Healey Act and other services to carry out laws which Congress has enacted in former years. The reduction set out in this bill when added to reductions in the last 3 or 4 years, will mean that the funds to operate the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor have been cut about 50 percent in that length of time. This is nothing more than legislating through appropriations. It is an indirect way for the opponents of organized labor and of the Labor Department of our Government to come in the back door to cripple labor legislation which is now on the books. The money that this amendment will restore in itself is but a small part of the major reductions the administration and the leaders of the Appropriations Committee have inflicted on the Department of Labor.

The departments under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Labor have been cut almost 20 percent in the recommendations of the Appropriation Committee for this year's budget. The Bureau of Labor Standards has been cut \$374,000—Veterans' Reemployment Service, \$46,000 and the Bureau of Apprentice Training, \$700,000. This large reduction for the apprentice training program not only cripples industry throughout the country but will greatly hamper our defense effort. During the last 12 years, millions of young boys have spent several years in the military forces of the United States. While they were thus serving, they could not prepare themselves for future livelihood through taking the advantage of the additional opportunities of apprentice training to prepare themselves to qualify as a member of the various crafts doing specialized work in our industrial economy. We can read in

almost every daily paper, where defense industries are advertising for mechanics, bricklayers, plasterer, molders, glass cutters and young men who are qualified and experienced in various other lines of the skilled workmanship. Millions of our young veterans have been unable to adequately prepare themselves through apprentice training and by making a reduction of this magnitude for this division of our Labor Department, the number of graduate apprentices will be fewer than at present.

I believe that major reductions in appropriations for these departments is false economy, will hinder our defense efforts and merely postpone the day until industry can hire the required number of skilled craftsmen.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has been cut \$700,000, the Employees Compensation by \$80 million. These are all services which aid industrial management and organized labor in the carrying on of our mammoth war economy. The Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor has been reduced \$60,000. This has been a reduction of 17 percent and will affect the working conditions of over 20 million women in our country.

The above are some of the unwise curtailments in the Labor budget and I might mention here that the Appropriations Committee was indeed mistaken when they reduced the Food and Drug Administration by \$660,000. The Department looks after the health and welfare of every man, woman, and child in America and protects them from purchasing substandard drugs, bad food, and so forth.

The large reduction in the Public Health Service and the Office of Education will in the long run, prove not to be economy, but will curb the great efforts which are being expended against cancer, heart, neuralgia, rheumatism, arthritis, blindness, mental, venereal, and other diseases.

This Committee should also restore the \$900,000 reduction in the appropriation for Freedmen's Hospital and Howard University. Both of these institutions are practically under the same management and are doing a great work for the Negro people not only in this locality, but throughout the country.

I firmly believe that every effort should be made to economize, but when the people of America are called upon to eliminate and curtail necessary services like the above, I am of the opinion that it will prove false economy and set the clock of progress backward.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the amount provided in the bill is more than was ever appropriated for this division, with the exception of the last 4 years. It is almost exactly equal to the appropriation made for 1950. The table



on page 415 of the hearings indicates that the bulk of the work of this division is in connection with spot checking, and visiting new establishments where there are no complaints nor other indications of noncompliance with the act. The table shows that they anticipate spending less than 25 percent of their investigational activities on complaints. On questioning, it was found that during the first half of fiscal 1953 complaints had actually dropped 25 percent from 1952, instead of having increased, as the division had estimated.

My good friend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] said that if you do not believe in the 75-cent minimum wage, or if you do not believe in the Walsh-Healey Act, do not vote for this amendment. It is not quite as simple as that. Former Secretary of Labor, Mr. Maurice Tobin, just before he left office—I think it was one of his last acts—made a finding that “locality” under the Walsh-Healey Act covers the entire Nation. The cotton-textile industry has an injunction which is pending in the courts now, and it will take 18 months or 2 years for a question of this magnitude to be settled. Therefore, the work of the Wage and Hour Division should be reduced materially.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Illinois if it is not true that the complaints are 25 percent below last year?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes. Not only that, but if you will take the time to read the 1952 annual report of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the United States Department of Labor you will find that they claimed to have investigated a lot of establishments that really were not investigated at all.

They showed a high number of investigations by going into small establishments, making quick checks, and doing a small amount of interrogation; and they called those investigations. I have personal knowledge of various instances where these investigators have gone in and harassed the employees and employers.

The funds available to the Wage-Hour Division for inspection or enforcement activity, even with the reductions recommended, are certainly sufficient to provide an adequate program. I should like to remind the Congress that the Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted in 1938 and the Walsh-Healey Act in 1936. The provisions of these laws are well known to employers and employees alike—and every administrator has recognized that voluntary compliance by employers is the rule, and not the exception.

Certainly, any reduction in enforcement activity that may be necessitated by the recommended reduction in the Division's appropriation will not reduce enforcement activity below a sound or safe level.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is not this the agency of the Federal Government that supervises the operations of plants to make sure there are no violations of the child-labor law? Is not this the only agency that does that?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes; but this is a very small part of their work.

With most of the production of this country being handled by large industrial organizations, where they are highly unionized, they have for the most part, been living up to the wage and hour laws very rigidly. There are very few complaints on them. If there are violations, the unions are in a position to take care of the situation.

Mr. YATES. Are there not only approximately 16 million union members out of the whole working force in the country? Therefore, that is not a good argument in this respect. The unions cannot police the entire field of working conditions. This is the only agency that can make sure that the child-labor law is not abused.

Mr. BUSBEY. The unions watch everything in the entire plants. A plant does not have to be 100 percent unionized for the union to see that no labor laws are violated.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 65, noes 95.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Food and Drug Administration*

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392); the Tea Importation Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50); the Import Milk Act (21 U. S. C. 141-149); the Federal Caustic Poison Act (15 U. S. C. 401-411); and the Filled Milk Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64); reporting and illustrating the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for payment in advance for special test and analyses by contract; and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement operations; \$5,000,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 11, line 11, strike out “\$5,000,000” and insert “\$5,648,000.”

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this is the first amendment to be offered under the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

*Department of Health, Education, and Welfare*

Salaries and expenses, Food and Drug Administration:	
1953 appropriation.....	\$5,600,000
1954 estimate (revised).....	5,648,000
House committee allowance....	5,000,000
Total.....	—648,000
Restoration requested.....	586,000

The \$5 million for Food and Drug Administration carried in the bill reported by the House Appropriations Committee is 10.7 percent below the 1953 appropriation of \$5,600,000, 11.5 percent below President Eisenhower's revised 1954 budget of \$5,648,000, and 11.7 percent below the original estimate of \$5,663,000.

The amount of \$5,586,000 requested as an appropriation in lieu of the \$5 million recommended by the House committee is \$62,000 below the revised budget estimate of \$5,648,000 for 1954. The request for restoration of \$586,000 deletes the item of replacement of automobiles and foregoes the additional personnel requested for the increased work on the illegal sale of dangerous drugs which causes so many human tragedies.

The cut proposed by the House committee will drastically lessen the protection the public has been getting under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Enforcement cannot be curtailed against poisonous foods and dangerous drugs and cosmetics; that work is already far from adequate. Work on filthy and decomposed foods under which about 164 tons are being seized every week will have to be reduced by about 25 percent, and that on cheats, frauds, and fakes, including sale of oleomargarine as butter, will have to be curtailed even more.

In its report the committee points out that since 1947 the number of Food and Drug Administration employees in grade 14 or higher has increased from 12 to 59, and suggests that if this represents the increased productivity of these 47 employees they should be able to offset the \$648,000 reduction from the budget. Actually, the increase under this appropriation was from 11 in 1947 to 52 in 1952, or 41, while the additional increase of 6 occurred in the self-supporting appropriation of certification and inspection services.

The difference between the annual salaries of these 41 positions and what they would be getting had they not been advanced beyond grade 13 is approximately \$30,600 per annum. Since 1947 Congress has greatly increased both the operating and management workloads of the Food and Drug Administration by widening the scope of the law through the Miller amendment, the Oleomargarine amendment, and the Durham-Humphrey amendment. During the preceding war years the Food and Drug Administration had postponed promotions to save funds for vitally needed operations. Promotions since 1947 have been in observance of the mandate of Congress in the Classification Act that equal pay be given for equal work. Each of the promotions conformed to standards in effect throughout the civil service.

On May 14, 1953, the committee reported in the Department of Agriculture bill an appropriation of \$14,160,000 for the enforcement of the Meat Inspection Act. That provides for the necessary inspection of 100 percent of the meat products destined for interstate commerce.

Under its current appropriation the Food and Drug Administration can inspect only a small fraction of 1 percent



of the output of other foods and of all drugs and cosmetics. The hazards to consumer health and welfare from meat products is only a small fraction of the combined hazards from other foods and from drugs and cosmetics.

Under currently restricted programs on economic cheats alone, consumers are saved more than the 3.6 cents per capita tax required to support the present appropriation; health protection is clear profit.

Average employment under the House committee cut would be reduced from 897 estimated for 1953 and 891 requested for 1954, to 790, a reduction of 107 under 1953 and 101 under 1954. The restoration requested would permit of employment 7 below that requested in the revised 1954 estimate.

The effects of the cut recommended by the House committee would be as follows:

<i>Project, commodity, or item and House committee reduction</i>	
Work on filthy and decomposed foods.....	\$391, 500
Development of food standards....	16, 900
Work on other acts enforced by Food and Drug Administration, and miscellaneous project work.....	21, 400
Inspection of foods offered for importation.....	48, 300
Administrative services.....	34, 100
Enforcement of the oleomargarine amendment.....	74, 150
Delete item requested for increased personnel for work on illegal sale of dangerous drugs without prescription.....	36, 000
Delete item requested for replacement of 27 automobiles.....	25, 650
<hr/>	
Total reduction under House committee recommendation.....	648, 000

The effects of the cut after the requested restoration would be as follows:

Increased work on illegal sale of dangerous drugs.....	—\$36,000
Replacement of automobiles.....	—25, 650
Round off.....	—350
<hr/>	
Restoration requested.....	586, 000
<hr/>	
Total proposed appropriation for 1954.....	5, 586, 000

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It is also cut \$600,000 below last year, is that not correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Chairman, again I say in 1947 and 1948 when the Republicans had control of the Congress, this was one agency which they absolutely refused to touch because it is one of the most important agencies in our Government. This is the agency that protects the lives of people in our country. This is the agency that inspects food. This is the agency that has to do with the drugs that we use. This is the agency that you read about day after day, which takes from the shelves of drugstores all over the country some new drug which has turned out to be poisonous and may have killed people in a community. This is the agency that protects the public. It was testi-

fied only a short while ago before our committee that some store was injecting water into their turkeys around Thanksgiving time and making the turkeys weight 4 or 5 pounds more. If it had not been for the Food and Drug Administration, that case would never have been brought to light so far as we know. If you want an agency which looks after the purity of the foods that you eat, and if you want an agency that protects the water that you drink, or the medicine that you need when you are ill, this is the agency. This is the most foolish cut in my opinion that this committee has made. It is a cut that has never been made before in all the years I have been on this particular subcommittee because they have come before us year after year and told us of the advances they have made and the savings they have made for the people throughout the country in bringing to light all of the frauds which exist. This is the most severe cut that they have ever had.

Even on the item having to do with the control of filthy and decomposed foods has been cut. About 164 tons of filthy and decomposed foods are being seized every week by the Food and Drug Administration. If you want to take a chance on allowing filthy and decomposed food to be sold in the market place, and eating that kind of stuff, then you can go along with the committee, and refuse to go along with this particular amendment which I have offered. I know there are Members of Congress who have found fault with some of these decisions by the Food and Drug Administration, but I think they have always been honest decisions. They are decisions which perhaps did not affect your particular constituents, but they did in fact help to save the health and lives of men and women by refusing to allow unhealthy food or poisonous drugs to be sold, which are killing people at the present time. I hope the Congress will not say that we are going to cut an agency of Government that is responsible for the food and drugs that we use at the present time. There is no other agency in Government that gives us that protection. There is no other way we can get that protection. It seems to me that every person, when he gets an ache or pain, will take a chance on any kind of drug. They are flocking to the drugstores, trying this and that to straighten themselves out. If we do not have an agency like this, you are taking a chance and I am taking a chance, and every living person in this country is taking a chance.

I hope that this is one amendment the House will agree to today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. YATES. I object, Mr. Chairman. I would like to have some time.

Mr. BUSBEY. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is exactly correct. This is one agency of the Federal Government that must be protected because this agency protects the people of this Nation.

I urge you to take a look at the hearings. See just what this agency does, the comprehensive, essential duties it performs. It guards the American people against rotten food, harmful drugs, against mislabeling, against ruinous cosmetics, against watered poultry, and against importations of unhealthful patent medicines.

You who come from dairy areas will be interested to know that this agency protects the public from illegal sales of oleomargarine as butter. It guards against dangerous therapeutic methods.

When the Supreme Court recently announced a decision that limited the jurisdictional scope of this agency, I received a number of letters from women in my district, as I am sure you did, urging the Congress to pass a law immediately to remedy the limitation imposed by the Supreme Court. The women know how important it is for the family's food to be safe and healthful. They know the good work this agency was performing. It would unquestionably be shortsighted economy to hamstring this agency by clinging to the committee's recommendation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course we all admit we should protect the agency, but is there any evidence that \$5 million will not do the job or that \$5,700,000, or whatever the figure is, will do the job?

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will look at page 46 of the hearings where the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] asked Mr. Crawford why the fines were decreasing; he replied that the loss was attributable to the fact that there was a decrease in the inspection staff. Obviously, if you have a decrease in the amount of funds necessary for the operation of this agency, you will have fewer inspectors, you will have fewer people checking up to maintain the high standards of quality in food and drugs that the American people want and deserve.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us what the decrease comes out of. Is it general administration or inspectors' salaries, or what?

Mr. FOGARTY. It will come out of both, but there will be certain provisions that they will not be able to carry on. As I said, they are now seizing 164 tons of decomposed food every week. It will



cut that to about 50 percent. That is one thing they will have to cut.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. They have now 200 inspectors.

Mr. YATES. That is correct. They have 208 now, as opposed to 243 that they had before this year. If the committee's figure is approved, the Department will have to discharge more inspectors. The public is bound to suffer.

This is a good agency. I refer the chairman of the subcommittee to his own statement on page 45 of the hearings, where he stated it was a good agency:

I might say I had occasion to make a personal investigation concerning the horsemeat scandal in Chicago last year.

In connection with my investigation I went into the Chicago office of the Food and Drug Administration and the people there were very cooperative and helpful in giving me the information and data needed.

Mr. BUSBEY. Their cooperation in helping to prosecute the people who were selling horsemeat for beef was excellent.

He compliments the people in the Chicago office in the job they are doing; yet he advocates cutting its funds to the point where it will not be able to continue to do its fine work.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. For the benefit of the gentleman from Minnesota I may say that this is only a \$5,663,000 request for the inspection of these dangerous foods all over the country. In 1953 we appropriated almost \$15 million just for meat inspection alone in the Department of Agriculture. I am for that, but here we are reducing by \$600,000 an item that touches people all over the country.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It is true, of course, that the Department of Agriculture in addition to inspecting beef inspects fruits and vegetables.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will permit me to finish I would direct his attention to page 41 of the hearings where the filth and disease in foods are described, evils which should be condemned and corrected. This is one bureau of the Government that is doing a necessary and admirable job in protecting the American people and it in turn should be commended, not curtailed by appropriations cuts.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I wish to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] for calling attention to the fact that I paid a compliment to the Food and Drug Administration office in Chicago for its cooperation in securing the information I wanted. It would have been rather embarrassing for me to tell about my intimate knowledge of this program, as it operates out at the ground level, but if he wants to bring this out I appreciate it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I regret I cannot yield at this time.

In this bill, we allow the sum of \$5 million for the Food and Drug Administration. You can do a lot of inspecting

with \$5 million. In addition, the departments of health of the various States and cities inspect the same things.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. Not at this time; I have only a few minutes.

The bill is in excess of the amount appropriated for 1950 and all prior years. The committee has relieved the Food and Drug Administration of the expense of purchasing 27 new automobiles by providing language in the bill which will allow the Secretary to transfer necessary automobiles from other bureaus that have excess cars.

There has been wholesale upgrading of positions in the Food and Drug Administration since the end of World War II. The number of positions in the top Civil Service grades, GS-14 through 18, has increased from 12 in 1947 to 59 in 1952. During this time the total number of positions has actually decreased slightly. There have been no major changes in the law during this period which would place additional responsibilities and burdens on the employees and justify higher grades than in 1947.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I must yield to my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. I feel I would not be honest with the House if I did not call attention to what they have done up in my country. There, a lot of beets are raised and canned. In order to can them they have to be cut, and they have a machine that cuts them in the form of a globe, round. The finished product is advertised and labeled as cut beets. The Food and Drug Administration, in spite of the fact that the label clearly and honestly disclosed what they were, refused to let them go on and can those beets. If they would stop doing things that are ridiculous they would have plenty of money with which to operate.

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. May I say that, in my opinion, the basic work of this agency is most valuable. The members of the committee would be the last ones in the House of Representatives to cripple these activities. I think that the \$5,000,000 allowed in this bill will give them ample funds to continue any and all necessary activities.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I would like to say to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], that I have not been able to get that New York beet case straight in my mind yet. He spoke to us about that in subcommittee. There are other articles of food on which the labels must conform to certain standards. If there is a premium on what they call baby beets and they cut up a big beet to make it look like a baby beet, under these standards, the Food and Drug Administration has the right to make that decision.

Mr. TABER. That is ridiculous.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is the fact. Check it.

(Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 61, noes 100.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### *Freedmen's Hospital*

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard University" for salaries of technical and professional personnel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such university; \$2,750,000: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary from any other appropriation in this title: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That legal residents of areas outside the District of Columbia shall be given care and treatment only if arrangements are made in advance for such persons, or the Government agency having responsibility for such persons, to reimburse Freedmen's Hospital in full for the cost of such care and treatment: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed upon him by the foregoing proviso.

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks immediately after those of Mr. BUSBEY made in reference to the amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY to the wage and hour section of this bill.)

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: Page 12, line 10, after the word "university", strike out "\$2,750,000" and insert "\$3,250,000."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read another amendment of mine on page 13, line 1, through line 6.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: Page 13, line 1, after "each quarter", strike out through line 6 to "treatment."



Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, do I understand the gentleman just wanted that amendment reported for the information of the Committee? He is not undertaking to join them?

Mr. POWELL. Whatever the majority leader decides.

Mr. HALLECK. I think that it would be better to consider them separately. One has to do with an amount of money and the other has to do with an entirely different matter, as to the right of people to be admitted to hospitals.

Mr. POWELL. If there is no objection I will discuss them together, and then we can vote on them separately.

Mr. HALLECK. I would rather have them treated separately.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I asked the Clerk to read the second amendment, because they have to be discussed together even if in the opinion of our majority leader they should be voted on separately.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. May we have the amendment reported again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: On page 12, line 10, after "university", strike out "\$2,750,000" and insert "\$3,250,000."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, this increase is roughly about the original amount asked by the President and by Mrs. Hobby. Freedman's Hospital is the only hospital in the Nation's Capital that cares for Negro patients without any cost.

The committee at the top of page 13—and I must bring this out—has inserted brand new language for the first time in the history of any appropriation bill stating that Freedman's Hospital shall take care of only the legal residents of the District of Columbia only if arrangements are made in advance for those outside of the District. This rule is not applied to any other hospital in our Capital. It is absolutely preposterous; it could not work. If I were hit by a car in front of the Capitol I would have to lie in the street until New York City made advance arrangements with Freedman's Hospital before I could be admitted. This is a town of visitors; it is a town of tourists; it is a town where people come to work from outlying communities, from Maryland, from Virginia, and under this provision no one can be treated in the only hospital treating Negroes on a free basis unless they are legal residents of the District of Columbia. So, on the basis of that preposterous type of provision they have reduced the cost of running Freedman's Hospital \$500,000.

Now, you cannot have both. If you are going to wipe out this new provision and let it remain as it was, a hospital admitting all people, then you have to increase the appropriation \$500,000 as

asked for by Mrs. Hobby. That is elemental.

I turned over to page 15 of the committee report and I note that St. Elizabeths Hospital was only cut \$10,000. The committee in its report admits that St. Elizabeths Hospital does not have many patients from the District of Columbia. I will read the exact language: "The committee is not disposed," and so forth and so on, "so long as Federal patients are a minor part of the patient load."

So St. Elizabeths Hospital has very few patients from the District of Columbia, yet the committee does not decrease its budget. It does not have this provision for any other hospital in the District of Columbia. This is flagrant discrimination; it strikes at the very heart of the Nation's Capital, the health of the visitors and strangers and workers, who happen to be Negroes, passing through here. There is no support for this. I am sure it is an oversight on the committee's part. I trust you will consider this as I have presented it.

You cannot have one hospital only for Negroes in this town and then say that only Negroes who are legal residents of the District of Columbia can go there. What will happen to the hundreds of thousands of visitors who come here and get hurt in accidents? Where are they going to go? There is no hospital anywhere to take care of them.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. What was the budget on this matter?

Mr. POWELL. The budget on this was the amount I am asking for, \$500,000 more; \$3,250,000.

Mr. RAYBURN. I understood the budget was \$3,304,000.

Mr. POWELL. Maybe it is.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not think the gentleman is asking for that much. He is asking for \$3,250,000.

Mr. POWELL. Yes; \$3,250,000.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is less than the budget.

Mr. POWELL. It is less than the budget. I respect my leader's advice on this matter. I ask the committee to endorse this amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word,

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. In scanning the budget figures, and I believe I have the right figures here, the so-called Truman budget asked for \$3,246,000, the so-called Eisenhower budget \$3,104,000, or 3 percent below the so-called Truman Democratic budget. The committee has cut this to \$2,750,000, or about 11 percent below the Eisenhower budget, according to the figures I have.

I agree with the gentleman from New York that whether this has been done knowingly or not, this certainly presents a case of clear-cut discrimination against the visiting Negro people that come to the city of Washington and who are barred from any of the other hospitals. Therefore I think the funds

should be restored. This fund should be restored according to the gentleman's amendment.

I call attention to another important thing this cut does. This hospital is the teaching hospital for the Howard University Medical School as well as being a major hospital for Negroes in the Capital. The committee has cut salaries and expenses by \$446,000. It is common knowledge throughout the United States that we do not have enough doctors and enough nurses. It is my knowledge that the deficiency in doctors and nurses among the Negro population, the doctors who will attend to the needs of the Negro population, is far below the deficiency among the white doctors who attend to the white people. This is one place where the Negroes can come and learn to be doctors. Certainly, if we want to do something toward stopping socialized medicine, toward stopping this cry throughout the Nation because of the inadequacy of medical attention, this is a place where we can restore some money and restore the teaching fund for young new doctors in the Negro race at this university. For this reason, as well as the reasons brought out by the gentleman from New York, I think this is an unwise cut, and I ask that the gentleman's amendment be sustained.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. I want to take this opportunity to compliment him on his presentation and discussion of this problem yesterday on the floor of the House. I fully agree with him in every respect. I also agree with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Here again, we find a foolhardy type of economy being thrust at us by the Members on the other side of the aisle. Freedmen's Hospital consists of a general hospital with a total of 347 beds and 51 bassinets; a tuberculosis hospital consisting of 135 beds; and an out-patient department composed of 36 organized clinics and 2 emergency operating rooms. It would appear, from the testimony set forth in the hearings on this bill, that this institution is in need of everything except patients. It is understaffed; its food rations are under standard; its facilities are badly in need of repair and expansion. One point that the committee brought out in its report is that certain communities adjacent to the District of Columbia have refused to reimburse the hospital for the care of their indigent Negroes. These nearby counties, although claiming adequate facilities for such care within their own boundaries, have been found lacking in this respect. Consequently, when an emergency case arrives at the door of Freedmen's Hospital, the patient must be admitted regardless of his residence in nearby Maryland. So many factors must be considered in the administration of a hospital—factors that we, on the outside, are not entirely aware of—that I feel we can afford to accept the testimony of the hospital officials and the



Bureau of the Budget in appropriating the funds carried in the budget request.

I hope every Member of the House will vote in favor of the amendment offered by our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

There is no justification for the committee's action in cutting the appropriations for Freedmen's Hospital and for Howard University—just as there was no justification for President Eisenhower's new Budget Director to reduce the figures which the administration of President Truman proposed as a minimum on which these two fine institutions could be operated in the next fiscal year.

I congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] in his efforts to restore these unnecessary and uncalled-for cuts and I sincerely hope the House membership will support him this afternoon.

Howard University is the principal college in the United States for the education of Negroes. It gives graduate work and has eight professional schools. These cuts the Republican Budget Director proposes and the additional slashes by the Appropriations Committee will mean that the college will not be able to get needed additional buildings and will also mean reduction in teacher personnel.

The Truman budget called for \$4,875,000 for Howard University; the Eisenhower budget goes 44 percent below the Truman figure and proposes \$2,735,000. As inadequate as the Eisenhower budget is, the committee's figure is even worse, \$2,260,000.

Freedmen's Hospital is the teaching hospital for Howard University Medical School and is the major hospital for Negroes in Washington. The serious cuts taken in appropriations for this institution will seriously hamper its great work.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] to restore these funds should be adopted.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is a rather grave misunderstanding of the intent of the committee with regard to the appropriation for Freedmen's Hospital. The committee certainly does not, by any stretch of the imagination, desire to cripple the program at Freedmen's Hospital in any such manner as was described by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. I can appreciate his anxiety over this appropriation. The situation at Freedmen's Hospital is this: The hospital is reimbursed by the District of Columbia for care and treatment of people who go there from the District of Columbia. People are being sent there from Montgomery County, Prince Georges County, and other nearby areas, and the hospital is receiving practically no reimbursement. The committee, for several years, has been trying to get the hospital and those

nearby counties and cities to work out arrangements whereby they will pay for their patients, the same as the District of Columbia reimburses for District patients. Let me read to you the language in the report last year when the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] was the chairman of the committee. The language is as follows:

As a result of the committee's recommendations in last year's report, the hospital officials investigated the possibility of securing reimbursement for indigent patients from Virginia and Maryland on a basis similar to that for indigent patients from the District of Columbia. Their report of progress in this regard is set forth on pages 83 and 84 of the hearings. The committee is satisfied that progress has been made but notes with regret that one nearby county that has many of its indigent residents cared for at this hospital is reported to have refused the cooperation extended by all other respondents. It is hoped that this difficulty may be resolved without the necessity of resorting to a special limitation on the use of the funds provided by this appropriation. A further report on progress made in securing reimbursements where due will be expected when the 1954 request is submitted for the committee's consideration.

Unfortunately, little progress has been made. I am willing to concede the gentleman's anxiety about the language in the bill, and the committee would seek his advice, counsel, and cooperation as to how he would change the language in order to take care of the situation I have described and also to take care of the situation which he brought up regarding emergency cases of colored persons being injured in the District of Columbia. If it would be acceptable to the gentleman from New York, we could add a proviso in the bill, right after the word "treatment" on page 6, as follows: "except emergency cases arising in the District of Columbia." The committee would have no objection to that amendment. We want to do everything possible to help and, not to retard, the situation at Freedmen's Hospital. At present, the District of Columbia is paying for the care of its patients, and the surrounding cities and counties are not paying the cost of the care given their patients.

All we were trying to do was to shift that financial burden from the Federal Government to the neighboring counties, cities, and States that have their patients cared for at the hospital. This language was not put in with any intent to damage the program of Freedmen's Hospital.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. If I do accept your change in the second amendment, then you will have to increase the allotment for the hospital, because you have based your allotment now on no patients coming in except those who are legal residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BUSBEY. Most of the patients sent there at present are from the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia reimburses the hospital for their care.

Mr. POWELL. But what about those who are not legal residents of the District of Columbia?

Mr. BUSBEY. What would the gentleman from New York suggest?

Mr. POWELL. I suggest that the budget be increased to take care of it.

Mr. BUSBEY. That does not solve the situation confronting us.

Mr. POWELL. I will accept your change in the amendment offered at page 13 if you will accept my amendment on page 12. You cannot increase the caseload without increasing the funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BUSBEY was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BUSBEY. I may say that, if this language will stay in the bill to apply to the surrounding neighborhoods, they certainly would not need the full amount of \$500,000.

Mr. POWELL. But at the same time you will have cases that are not District of Columbia cases. I want to ask this question: Are you going to have this same language apply to all of the other hospitals, health and mental institutions under this budget in the District of Columbia, or just this one hospital dedicated to Negro patients only? You have said in your report that St. Elizabeths Hospital does not have residents of the District of Columbia except a minor portion.

Mr. BUSBEY. Seventy percent of the patient load in St. Elizabeths Hospital is from the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia reimburses the hospital for those patients. There is very serious consideration being given, I understand, to having St. Elizabeths Hospital transferred to the District of Columbia.

Mr. POWELL. Is the non-District of Columbia case load at Freedmen's Hospital more than 50 percent? It is not. It is 18 percent.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman was more fortunate than the committee. We could not get that information.

Mr. POWELL. I got it today. In fact, I went there last night. I do not think you are doing the right thing by putting in any type of prohibitory regulations on the one Negro hospital in the District of Columbia and not putting it on all of the others.

Mr. BUSBEY. I assure the gentleman there is no one on the committee who wishes to discriminate against Freedmen's Hospital.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If this sort of arrangement goes in in respect to Freedmen's Hospital, I am certain it ought to go right across the board. I would assume that there are hospitals in the surrounding areas available.

Mr. POWELL. No; there are not. That is the great problem. The surrounding area of the District of Columbia has mushroomed so rapidly in the past years that the facilities in Maryland and Virginia are not adequate to



take care of either the white or the Negro caseload. The result is that the Negro patients are being cared for mostly in the District of Columbia. With this arrangement you are saying that the patients can continue to come to the District of Columbia to be cared for—and I think they should be, because this is the crossroads; this is the No. 1 tourist attraction. We have hundreds of thousands who are working here who do not live here.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me make my position clear, because I had not known of it until the gentleman called it to my attention. I can go along with that except as to the treatment of emergency cases arising in the District of Columbia; I certainly can go along with that. But I think likewise if I understand the gentleman correctly he would agree with me that while facilities in some of these outlying areas may not be as adequate as they should be for all of the people, there is a responsibility on them to make their own facilities adequate; and, certainly, to say to them that we will take care of the whole responsibility in the District of Columbia would not be quite the way that it ought to be done, because fortunately or unfortunately there are a lot of States in the Union that are not adjacent to the District of Columbia and where also their facilities are not adequate. It is up to them to make them adequate.

Mr. POWELL. I suggest that since this is a problem which transcends Negro patients and is a District problem that we abolish this provision on page 13 for this year and give to Freedmen's Hospital its budget for this year and then the committee concern itself with the overall question of how the treatment of indigents affects all the hospitals; that we deal with the problem next year after adequate opportunity for study rather than to pick on the only Negro hospital this year.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. It would appear to me that in the case of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] he is strengthened in trying to raise this budget limit if we accept the language suggested, because then Freedmen's Hospital would have a larger load and it would need more money to carry it.

Mr. BUSBEY. That is true.

Mr. RAYBURN. So it seems to me that if the language is changed then certainly we ought to provide additional funds to meet the additional load.

Mr. BUSBEY. Not entirely. If the language were revised the way I suggested, the hospital would be reimbursed by adjacent States, at least for all but emergency cases.

Mr. RAYBURN. The States do not have to reimburse.

Mr. HALLECK. If the language on page 13 were to stay in with the proviso that was suggested by the chairman, then we would have a situation under which indigent patients from surrounding areas would necessarily have to make arrangements of their own for reimbursement to Freedmen's Hospital which

in addition would in some measure at least reduce the overall expense of maintenance of the hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes in order that we may clear up this situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from New York to page 348 of the hearings. He will find that there is a very small percentage of Federal patients in St. Elizabeths Hospital; that the hospital is reimbursed for the District of Columbia patients that are there. The patients for which St. Elizabeths Hospital is not reimbursed are legally the responsibility of the Federal Government. I just wanted to clear that up for the record because I think there was a little misunderstanding on that.

Now, just to try to resolve the question and find the fair way to do it, I ask the gentleman from New York if we should agree to eliminate the language on page 13—and I am just exploring this—would the gentleman agree to raise the amount not \$500,000 but to the 1953 appropriation which was \$2,860,700?

Mr. POWELL. If you leave it at that amount then that means there will be no repairs this year at all. I was at Freedmen's Hospital last night after we adjourned. I would not like any Member of this body to go to Freedmen's Hospital. It is a disgrace. There are rooms there, private rooms, not the wards, that have not been painted in 10 years in that hospital. The plaster has fallen down in the private rooms. I am not going to talk about the wards. There has not been a good facelifting done there. They have not funds for the extermination of insects. They have not funds allotted for that in a hospital in the Nation's Capital which receives funds from this Congress. That is what they are asking for. They want to give the hospital a facelifting which has been due for 9 years. They have asked for it before.

Mr. BUSBEY. As the gentleman knows, all legislation is compromise in the final analysis. The gentleman has an amendment pending to increase this to \$3,250,000. Would the gentleman agree to an amount of \$3,104,000, which is the revised budget? I think that is exceedingly fair to everybody concerned.

Mr. POWELL. I accept that.

Mr. BUSBEY. And take out the language on page 13?

Mr. POWELL. And take out the language on page 13.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from New York would be in order to ask unanimous consent to revise his pending amendment?

The second one will stand as offered. Bring it in line with the figures agreed upon.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I so ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL:

On page 12, line 10, after the word "university", strike out "\$2,750,000" and insert "\$3,104,000."

And on page 13, line 1, after "each quarter", strike out through line 6 "and treatment."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment as corrected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that this situation has adjusted itself because an awful lot of honest misunderstanding could have resulted if the language of the bill and the amount contained in the bill were continued and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] was defeated.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I want it distinctly understood that in trying to cooperate on this matter the committee does not relinquish its position in trying to make these surrounding neighborhoods pay their share toward the support of Freedmen's Hospital.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, may I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the situation in the District of Columbia in relation to hospitals and hospital treatment is somewhat different from other sections of the country. I became aware of that when I introduced a bill a few years ago which passed the Congress and is now law amending the Hospital Center Act.

You will remember that there are three hospitals in the District that constituted the Hospital Center. We also passed a bill authorizing \$11 million contributions by the Federal Government and the District of Columbia toward the building of either 5 or 6 other private hospitals in the District of Columbia. That bill is now law.

One of them, for example, is the Children's Hospital that will receive a grant of about \$450,000 toward additions to that hospital.

Another one is the new Providence Hospital. Then there are 3 or 4 other hospitals that can receive up to 50 percent contribution in the case of the construction of a new hospital. We found that the adjoining communities in Maryland and Virginia were not able to meet the hospital requirements of the people. A good number of people living in adjoining Maryland and Virginia are people who work in the District of Columbia and because of that and other unusual conditions existing in the District in relation to hospital facilities it



was recognized in the field of private hospitals that the situation justified legislative action of a favorable nature. I assume that if it exists in relation to private hospitals the same situation exists in relation to St. Elizabeths and Freedman's Hospitals. So, I am glad that this situation has been adjusted. It can be looked into in the coming year and care and caution should be taken, as I am sure it will be, that no injustice in the future is done.

While I am on my feet, I also want to talk about the amendment that will be offered in relation to Howard University. Again, it is a situation that we should view with tolerance and with understanding. We saw the other day newspaper reports of a local election in Atlanta, Ga., where an outstanding American of the colored race, as I remember, was elected to the school board. In any event, he was elected to a public office in Atlanta. It has national significance. That was one of the finest things that I have seen happen in many years. That brings about better understanding. It shows that the relationship between Americans of different racial origins and of different colors and of different creeds has made marked advancement, and for us to cut sharply, as I think has been done—and I do not accuse the committee intentionally of intending to do so—but to cut sharply as we have in the case of Howard University, is unwise. Howard University occupies an unusual situation in relation to the universities of our country. I think if we adopt the amendment that will be offered that it will not only be justified from the angle of the facts, but from the broader angle it would be justified, because failure to do so will bring about severe hardships upon Howard University, which would bring about in turn a feeling of discrimination either intentionally or unintentionally.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment that the gentleman from New York will offer will be adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Howard University*

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Howard University, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds, \$2,240,000.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. CHURCH: On page 13, line 12, after the word "grounds", strike out "\$2,240,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,535,000."

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, it is a strange situation, indeed, when I find myself rising to increase an item in an

appropriation bill, because, like my good friends and colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the House, I am convinced that national solvency is almost the first order of the day. When, however, it comes to a cut in an appropriation for an educational institution, a cut which affects the heart and the lifeblood and the essential usefulness of that institution, I rise momentarily, at least, above the principles of stark economy. May I say to the Committee on Appropriations that there is no committee in the House, not even including the two to which I have the honor to belong, to which I pay such great and such merited tribute. I fully know of the hours that these men spend in research, of the earnestness of their study, of their disinterested appraisal; and I hope that you will let me add my conviction that their interest in human needs never ceases. I know in addition that they are reasonable—and it is to their sweet reasonableness that I would like to appeal in support of my amendment.

May I point out in turn that I have been extremely reasonable, because when I went home last night I planned to offer 2 amendments to this section. I now offer only 1. If you will permit me, since you have been gracious enough to give me an extra 5 minutes, I am going to talk to you first about the amendment which I decided not to offer.

In the committee report on the bill you will notice that this section provides first of all a certain sum for salaries and expenses, including maintenance and repair of facilities. The Eisenhower budget approved \$2,535,000 for that item. The present bill allows \$2,240,000, cutting appropriations for tuition, salaries, and equipment, and so forth, on the educational side, and repairs to the plant, by \$295,000.

I would say in passing that it is only to that section that my amendment refers. I am moving to remove the cut and to restore in the bill the original amount for this purpose approved in the Eisenhower budget.

In addition, the Eisenhower budget allowed \$30,000 for plans and specifications, which was eliminated by the committee; and for construction, \$170,000, of which the committee wisely allowed \$20,000, leaving a difference of \$150,000.

When I went home last night, and before I talked with Howard University, and before I talked with the Department which Mrs. Hobby now heads, it had been my intention to offer two amendments, one to the first section, which I have done; and one to restore the amount recommended in the Eisenhower budget for the second section. I would like to tell you briefly why I did not offer the second amendment.

I found by talking with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that the Department is not worried about the \$30,000 for plans for a premedical science building, since it is expected, as the committee says in its report, that funds appropriated in prior years will be made available for this project.

In addition, I find that even the Department itself is inclined to agree with

the committee that there is considerable controversy about the turbogenerator. They are perfectly willing, I am told, that further studies be made of this matter. Therefore I have not offered an amendment which would restore to the paragraph the amount for plans and specifications which, I repeat, will be taken care of out of prior appropriations, or the amount for the turbogenerator. In other words, my amendment, which does add \$295,000 to the bill, refers only to the amount for salaries and operating expenses, and repairs as well.

I know that my colleague from Illinois has as strong an interest in the Negro people as I have. I know that he is interested also in education. However, I dare to claim perhaps a more intimate knowledge about the expense of college administration these days, because from 1940 to 1950 I did nothing else but attempt to plan fund raising, to attempt to aid budget making, and actually to go out and raise funds for one of the great colleges of this country.

I know this, Mr. Chairman: If you cut \$295,000 from the Government appropriation toward the total budget for Howard University of \$5,229,839, you make a cut which has to be absorbed in essential, important places and functions.

Now in such a case, what can a university do? A State college can go out and ask for more money from the State legislature. Howard University has only this Congress. Except for tuition and a few research grants, it is completely dependent on this Congress. Some colleges would, in such an emergency, feel compelled to raise tuition fees. You know, however, it is to our glory that the tuition fees of Howard University remain today only \$260 per person. I am told even at that low figure, many—for financial reasons—turn away; many who need and merit education. It would be impossible for Howard University to do what we want it to do, if it were forced materially to increase its tuition, and to lift its opportunities thoroughly out of the reach of that group which cannot pay more. Oh, you might say, "All right, keep up your educational facilities, but do away with your repairs." Well, I heard over the radio last night that the bursting of a pipe in a tunnel at Howard University had cost the lives of two old employees, one most beloved. I do not believe that Howard University can absorb this cut and yet make necessary repairs. I have checked and find that such repairs do indeed come under this particular paragraph. The only other way to absorb the proposed cut would be by a drastic and tragic cut in the faculty and educational facilities. I would say again to my good subcommittee chairman: When you cut a university or college faculty, you do not cut for 1 year, you cut for the unforeseeable future because you have to eliminate from the lower echelons who are building up the coming strength of a college.

Now let me tell you a little bit more. If I had any lack of faith in Howard University, I would not come before you with this plea. I wonder if you know that Howard University was founded in



1867 by a Republican Congress just 2 years after one of the most troubled periods that this country ever experienced. It was founded as a symbol of strength, as an opportunity, as a great hope. In 1952, including the summer session, it educated 4,811 people. It has approximately 450 faculty members. It maintains 10 schools and colleges plus a summer school and evening classes for adult education. Its undergraduate school gives courses in the liberal arts, pharmacy, music, engineering, and architecture. In its graduate and professional schools, degrees are given in social work, law, medicine, and dentistry, and graduate degrees also in religion. It has 39 buildings to operate and keep in repair, and 9 of them are temporary wooden buildings. It has 55 acres of land. Its roster of graduates brings forth the names of the leaders of the race throughout the years of our history. Of 16,000 graduates, 721 have won renown as religious leaders, 685 as pharmacists, 398 as engineers and architects, and 7,000 as teachers. It has 13 national honorary societies, established because of its academic standing, including Phi Beta Kappa. It is one of the few Negro colleges that has Army and Air Force ROTC courses; and prior to World War II, Howard University trained more than 50 percent of all the Negro officers in our Armed Forces.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I will yield at the end, if the gentleman will forgive me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add just this. As I thought over this problem last night, I thought in terms of three things. I thought of a great President who has made us face up to the fact that this country is spending 73 percent of our budget on forces and tools of war and on military and other forms of aid abroad. I thought in terms of the fact that this House of Representatives the other afternoon in a whiff of time voted \$55 million above what the administration asked, a total of \$195 million, for the conservation of soil, and we do need soil conservation. But, we also need to provide for the conservation of our youth. I thought of something else. I would wager, with reference to the money that the State Department pays to bring foreign students and others over to this country, that we spend more than this \$295,000 a year. And why do we bring them? We bring them here to see democracy as it works. And how could we hold up our heads if we brought them to a National Capitol where we were reducing the training staff and educational opportunities of a group of our citizens to whom we promise full opportunity and who have proved that they deserve it? I sincerely hope that the amendment passes, and, Mr. Chairman, I wish to apologize again to my good friend, the gentleman from New York, for not yielding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot attempt to match the magic eloquence with which

this amendment has been presented, but I feel I would not be honest with the House of Representatives if I did not tell it what the situation was with which the committee was confronted when it faced this problem of providing funds for Howard University.

It was not a question of whether we should maintain Howard University as soundly and as effectively as might be done, but it was a question as to whether or not we should take into consideration the job problem that we had to face.

Let me call your attention to the facts.

These are tables that were submitted to the committee, at its request, by the university, and they appear on page 104 of part 1 of the hearings on Federal Security.

Enrollment, 1948, gross 7,231; full-time equivalent, 6,268; 1949, gross 6,609; 5,557 full-time equivalent; 1950, gross 5,712; 4,821 full-time equivalent; 1951, gross 5,069; 4,236 full-time equivalent; 1952, gross 4,811; 3,870 full-time equivalent; 1953, gross 4,506; 3,428 full-time equivalent.

In other words, the budget request was not proportioned at all to the decrease in enrollment, and the work that the institution had to do.

The committee did not make a cut which was commensurate with the decrease in enrollment and the decrease in the work that it had to do. It made a very modest cut. The cut from the revised budget was from \$2,535,000 to \$2,240,000, or a little over 15 percent, and the estimated reduction in number of full-time enrollments is down more in proportion from the high figure for all these things than the cut.

I do wish that the House would not be guided by sentiment entirely in voting money, regardless of the need, but that they will be guided by their heads and realize that while we must provide for the proper education of the people who go to Howard University, we should not, if we expect the institution to be sound and successful and properly administered, allow it funds on the basis of many more students than the enrollment figures which they gave us show they are entitled to.

Under those circumstances it does seem to be that we should not adopt this amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. May I remind the distinguished gentleman from New York talking about decreased enrollment, it is necessary for them to maintain the same number of classes if they keep up the educational standards of the school. Back in 1948 when they had a gross enrollment of 6,000 probably the teachers were handling as many as 25 or 30 students per class. The only way you could make a reduction would be to cut out some of the classes.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid the gentleman has missed the point.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not think so.

Mr. TABER. At the peak you had anywhere from 7,200 students a year. A quarter of that would be 1,800, and that would be the average number in a class.

It cannot take anywhere near as many teachers or instructors, or as much classroom requirement, or as much of anything else to operate an average of 1,125 as it would for 1,800. A reasonable approach to the problem, therefore, is a reduction in the cost, and that is the only way you can keep a faculty up on its toes and keep an institution operating effectively. When you give an institution more money than it needs on which to operate, you destroy its effectiveness and it is worse for the students than when they are a little short, because then the professors will take more interest and do a better job.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 4 to be reserved to the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] for 3½ minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POWELL. I have a substitute amendment at the desk. By calling for that now would my time be increased or not?

The CHAIRMAN. It would not.

(Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to yield his time to Mr. POWELL.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States, speaking to the country the other night, reminded us that we live in an era of peril. I wonder how seriously the words of the President are being taken by the members of his own party in this Chamber who in the name of economy would snatch away the stoutest hopes we have of meeting the challenge of the peril. As I have listened to the debate on the amendment to save Howard University my thoughts have been of the young man from Trinidad who drove the taxicab in which I rode one evening last week. He is a student of medicine at Howard University. On graduation he intends to return to Trinidad and pass the remainder of his life in service to his people as a physician. There are many such young men at Howard University. The expense to us of this education is small indeed compared with the dividends we shall receive in the most enduring kind of goodwill. Mr. Chairman, if we are to meet with triumph the perils of this era in a changing world we must have the abiding goodwill of the common people of other lands and of all races. The slash in the appropriation for Howard University which the committee's bill provides would do our country more damage in the loss of goodwill and of understanding than could be repurchased by ten thousand times the amount of money required for the proper maintenance of this great college of learning. I have deep respect for all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and I know it



must have been only through inadvertence that the university singled out for such a drastic reduction as to be fatal chanced to be a Negro university. But how would it be received by this young man from Trinidad if his education were cut short by the action of this Congress? What would be his interpretation? What would your interpretation be if you were of a minority race and one of the great universities that had meant so much to your people had been the target? Discrimination is poison that destroys individuals and destroys nations. I am sure that no discrimination could have been intended, but that is not the way our enemies would present it in their propaganda. To earn and to hold good will we must remain above even the suspicion of practicing any kind of discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand the thinking behind many items in this bill before us. It may be because mine is not the philosophy of the dollar. The dollar is important, but as the servant and not the master. What you on the other side of the aisle are attempting is to put the cart ahead of the horse. You raise the interest rate on the Federal debt, thus increasing tremendously the cost of Government, and cover up with slashed appropriations for education, public welfare, and labor that strike at the very foundations of democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] for his kindness.

I would like to state on behalf of the vast majority of the membership our appreciation for the very fine remarks of the gracious gentlewoman from Illinois. I did not think anyone could rise to object, even myself, although my amendment increased the amount even more. My good friend from New York who sometimes is swayed by the dollar sign more than anything else did not have the "sweet reasonableness" the gentlewoman thought she could implant in all of us. So where there is no warm heart may be cold logic will suffice, and I, therefore, would like to present a little cold logic and cold facts for the consideration of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York. You quote the year 1948 as the year in which the enrollment was at its peak. You are correct. But it so happens that that is the year when the GI bill of rights was operating at its peak and there was not a single educational institution anywhere in America that was not operating with crowded classrooms.

The average number of students per instructor at Howard University in 1948 was 23 incidentally a very good guess by the Congressman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY]. The average number of instructors in a class A university, according to the American Association of Universities and Colleges, should be 12.5. That is the aim of every single grade A university and college in America. The average at Howard University now is 15.4.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to be fair with the gentleman. I am a graduate myself of a great State university. I have been back there a few times and I know that some of those classes run up to 500.

Mr. POWELL. Surely.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman have any figures as to the student load per class per instructor in the over-all State universities?

Mr. POWELL. In the over-all State universities it runs between 14 and 18.

Mr. HALLECK. I am amazed at that figure. I do not dispute it because I do not have the information, but it seems to me from my observation it is much, much too low.

Mr. POWELL. When you attended the classes where there were 500, as I did, they were broken down into seminar groups and discussion groups. They were groups, very small, under fellows and under instructors.

Mr. HALLECK. I am quite sure as of today that is not correct because many of them are courses in economics and such subjects. At the conclusion of the year's work or the semester's work that is it.

Mr. POWELL. Then we cannot agree on this point. One thing we do agree on is that the colleges and universities of America were abnormally swollen so far as student bodies were concerned in 1948. That I am sure we all agree on because at that time the GI bill of rights was operating at its peak. The average was 23 per instructor at Howard University, now 15.

If you cut this amount, as you have, below the 15 percent, it means that Howard University will have to cut the faculty of the liberal arts college, because the college of law, the college of religion, the college of medicine, the college of dentistry, the college of engineering, the college of architecture, and the post-graduate colleges for masters and doctor of philosophy degrees are operating at peak. They are packed. There has been no decrease in enrollment in the post-graduate work at Howard University. The decrease has been only in the liberal arts. That means only in the liberal arts will the cut come. If you cut 15 percent plus of the total salaries of the total university, the reduction will come only in the liberal arts and I have been informed by the treasurer of the university this morning that that means one-third of the faculty of the liberal arts college will have to be dismissed. The average will be, as you said, 23 per instructor or 8 above what the American Association of Colleges and Universities suggests.

May I point out, whether you know it or not, Mr. Chairman, that you are trying to do, if the gentlewoman's amendment does not prevail, what not a single Southern legislative body is doing this year. There is not a single Southern legislative body that is cutting the appropriation for Negro or for white higher education.

When you talk, Mr. Majority Leader, about the fact that we must have one

paramount aim before us, "fiscal solvency," may I say that fiscal solvency means nothing if we have health and educational bankruptcy.

The gentleman from Indiana calls this the age of peril. The age of peril cannot be met if the first line of defense of our country, health and education, is allowed to crumble. Just the other day our President received a report from the National Manpower Council urging specific, immediate steps to increase the brainpower of America, because we are in need of it. This is not going to increase it; this is going to decimate it.

I would like to say to the gentlewoman from Illinois that I would like to see her amendment increased, but in deference to her graciousness in offering her amendment I will withdraw mine.

I would like to point out to the Committee also that Howard University generates its own electric power. They need a new turbogenerator which costs \$150,000. The committee says, "Buy your power from the Potomac Light & Power Co." All right. If they do, the Potomac Light & Power Co. informs me that Howard University will have to spend money to put the private power in, what they call the changeover switch gears, which cost \$180,000. Now, if you are not going to give them the money for the generator to generate their own power, then you have to give them \$180,000 to buy the changeover equipment. You cannot tell them to do something and not give them the money to do it with.

I stood here yesterday and told the Committee that they had struck out an appropriation to retube the boiler at Howard University; that the insurance company on April 6, the Globe Indemnity Co., warned Howard University that if they did not repair it they would cancel the policy. Last night the chief engineer and his assistant were scalded to death. You do not want this tragedy repeated, or do you? I do not think I need say anything more in this connection. I ask for support of the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman spoke about the turbogenerator. Is it not true that after the \$180,000 is spent for the changeover that the additional cost annually will be between twenty and thirty thousand dollars a year over the cost of the power if they generate their own power?

Mr. POWELL. The committee says they cannot understand why Howard University cannot operate under private power as cheaply at St. Elizabeths because they now have private power. St. Elizabeths method of generating their electricity was obsolete; Howard University's is not. The Public Buildings Service Committee and the Bureau of Mines testified before the committee that Howard University could make its electricity cheaper than using private power. But whether you give it to them or not,



you have to give them \$180,000 to buy the new equipment to put the private power in. They have not got the money and the Potomac Light & Power Co. is not going to give the money to them. What are you going to do?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution adopted by the supreme council of the order, Sons of Italy in America, in plenary session, Washington, D. C., April 11, 1953:

Whereas it is becoming increasingly evident throughout the entire Nation that the adoption of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 does not adequately solve immigration and naturalization problems, but, on the contrary, denies essential principles which have been of the utmost importance in the natural development of our beloved country, the United States of America; and

Whereas the general welfare of the people of our Nation requires that the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 be modified and amended to safeguard the inalienable rights heretofore enjoyed by all citizens of the United States; and

Whereas the problems surrounding immigration and naturalization have become serious problems not only for the people of the United States of America but also for the people of many other nations: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the supreme council of the order, Sons of Italy, in plenary session at the Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C., on April 13, 1953, That the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 be amended as follows:*

1. The inequalities and injustices which can and do arise under existing immigration quota system based on national origin should be minimized by the suggestions herein advanced.

2. The annual immigration quota should be 250,000, which number we believe can be conveniently absorbed by this country.

3. The quotas of all nations should be reexamined every 3 years. The number of visas to be allotted to each nation should be based upon the average number used by such nations during the preceding 3 years. All unused quotas should be reallocated. Countries which have used up to 90 percent of their quota should be allowed to participate in the distribution of unused quotas on the same ratio as heretofore established.

4. Adopted children under the age of 14 should be given preference and admitted in the same category as children are generally now admitted.

5. That parents of American citizens should be admitted as nonquota immigrants.

6. Although the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, should be continued as a part of the McCarran-Walter Act in order to make possible the codification of all laws relating to immigration and naturalization, the persons actually admitted as displaced persons should be admitted in addition to established quotas.

7. The judicial powers given to administrative officers, boards, and any other governmental agencies should be eliminated. Any person or persons having powers of prosecution, should not be granted any judicial powers which deprive an individual of his rights to trial by the courts of the United

States. Furthermore, the provisions of the statute of limitations heretofore existing should be reenacted.

8. Naturalized citizens should enjoy all the rights and privileges of native born citizens as heretofore established by the Constitution of the United States; be it further

*Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, and to the chairmen of both Senate and House Committees on Immigration and Naturalization.*

In witness whereof, I, the supreme venerable of the Order Sons of Italy in America, have hereunto set my hand, the date and year aforesaid.

GEORGE J. SPATUZZA,

*Supreme Venerable, Chicago, Ill.*

Attest:

A. A. DEMARTINIS,

*Supreme Recording Secretary, Philadelphia, Pa.*

(Mrs. KELLY of New York asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH]. I do not think it sufficient and I regret that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has withdrawn his substitute amendment, but due to his acceptance of the amendment of my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], I, too, support that amendment.

I think the best way to acquaint the Members of the House with the work of Howard University is to bring to their attention the statement made by its distinguished president, Dr. Mordecai Johnson, when he appeared before the committee during the hearings on this bill:

Howard University constitutes the only university organization in the States where the majority of Negroes live which offers a wide scope of undergraduate, graduate, and professional educational opportunities to Negro youth.

As a result of historical conditions beyond their control, the colored people in the United States have stood in an abnormal relationship to the tax-supported educational institutions within the States where the majority of them live.

Until very recent years they were not admitted to the State universities and professional schools which are regularly supported by State and Federal funds, and no first-rate separate university and professional school organizations were established from the public funds to serve them.

This lack of higher educational facilities among Negroes in the States where the majority of them live has resulted in a serious shortage of competent services in matters fundamental to their life, development, and security.

There is now a serious shortage among them of competent primary and high-school teachers; a serious shortage of physicians, nurses, dentists, pharmacists, architects and engineers, chemists, trained clergymen, and leaders of every kind.

Howard University exists primarily to serve the urgent of this disadvantaged tenth of the population.

During the 87 years of its work, the university has graduated 17,000 men and women. By far the majority of these graduates are serving as public-school teachers, building up a system of education in the States where the majority of Negroes live. Approximately 2,522 of them have become physicians and surgeons. This number approximates one-half of all Negro physicians and surgeons in the United States. Of these graduates 1,205

have become dentists. This number approximates half of all Negro dentists. Also, 1,472 have become lawyers; 735 of these graduates have become leaders in religion; 707 have become pharmacists, including a substantial number of owners of drugstores; 404 have followed engineering and architecture and other applied sciences; 359 of these graduates have entered the field of business; 201 have graduated for service in the field of social work. In every Negro population center of the United States, these graduates are rendering service to the people and they have had a substantial part in the remarkable development of the Negro race in America.

During the school year 1951-52 this institution served 4,811 students (inclusive of the summer school) in its 10 schools and colleges, namely; graduate, liberal arts, engineering and architecture, music, social work, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, law, and religion. Religion receives no support from Federal funds. All curricula are fully accredited by regional and national accrediting agencies; and I may say we have just received a vote of Phi Beta Kappa, the national honor society, to establish a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa there.

That is a very brief story of Howard University. Yet, the committee decided to reduce its appropriation \$510,000 less than the amount requested in the budget. I agree with my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. POWELL] in his statement that this bill is discrimination at its worst. I plead with the entire membership of the House to restore the appropriations for Howard University.

Mr. Chairman, like others on my side of the aisle, I figure we could vote for this appropriation bill as it has been reported to us by the committee, knowing that if we did so, we would be hanging our Republican colleagues on the tree of politics. But this is not the place for political expediency. We must examine these items of expense with a conscience and vote the necessary funds to continue to the full extent those agencies of the Government that have, through the years, proven their worth and have demonstrated that our faith in them has not been misplaced.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to take the time of the House, but it seems to me that a very important point in human relations, in this debate, is being overlooked; if one votes for this amendment, one appears to favor segregation, if one votes against it, one appears to favor integration; yet, at heart, no such thing is true.

I will vote for this amendment to provide more funds for Howard University because a factor higher than fancy, cold-blooded, heartless logic is at stake—the need to quench the thirst of men's minds which Howard University has so brilliantly done since its inception in the 1860's, as the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] so ably stated.

If you throw the integration, segregation issue into this debate, and make logic your queen, and not life your guide, you will be forced to admit that from here on in, as integration progresses, funds for Howard University will diminish until it closes its doors or operates as an institution without regard to origin.



This amendment is not just for colored people or for anyone else, but for a social fact in America which recognizes the voluntary gathering of people of every type.

I know, for example, of some Polish people who have recently come to America from the service of General Anders and the Polish Army; they have gathered together, not in a ghetto community, as one knew ghettos in Europe, where people were forced to live, but who have assembled voluntarily because they thought they could get ahead better, that it would be better to have their children live and grow up with sympathetic people and surroundings, until they could leave the nest and fend for themselves, to their liking, as Americans.

In the North the schools are open. In the South there are those who prefer to attend their own institutions in sympathetic surroundings, and who prefer to be leaders of their own people.

Often the educated fly the coop and do not come back to aid and lift up their own. There are aristocrats in the South, both white and colored. Each has high pride. Each is dedicated to the service of his fellow man. Each is free of shame for his own kind. I, for one, would not want to do anything to discourage them. Each to his way. That is godlike.

I would not care to cast a vote and not feel that I had done the best that I could to contribute to an institution that is doing so much for its own. You will recall when you go down to Mexico and see the remains of the Mayan civilization how they built high temples to their gods, how they built buildings, and in craven fear, offered human sacrifices, virgins, to appease seemingly wrathful deities. They had many and brave warriors. They had great areas of land. Some 8 to 12 millions of these Mayans were eventually wiped out because they just did not know anything about soil exhaustion, about soil conservation or crop rotation. They lived on corn and when the soil wore out hunger set in and they wandered and became duck soup for their enemies and they were overcome and disappeared. Just a little more knowledge about the soil and they might have survived, coming up from Guatemala to Yucatan. Ignorance. The pity of it.

I think our people would like to know that if you want to be a leader among your own, the Congress of the United States is not going to stand in the way of helping you become not only a better, but a more informed American. The amendment providing the additional funds for Howard University should pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in reading in the RECORD this morning the comments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] in opening his speech on this measure. He said:

Mr. Chairman, as a Democrat I would like to see this bill passed as it is presently constituted, without a single change because I

know that if it is passed in this shape it would mark the defeat of the Republican Party in the elections of next year and would see my party back in control of the House by 50 to 100 votes.

In supporting the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois, I call attention to the fact that Howard University was established by a Republican Congress. Since points of order had been raised in many subsequent Congresses by members of the now minority party, and since the then chairman of the Committee on Education, our distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. DAN REED, in the 70th Congress introduced what is now known as Public Law 634, 70th Congress, an act to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Howard University in the District of Columbia," approved March 2, 1867, as a matter of fact, a Republican Congress was responsible for establishing this and for eliminating the points of order against this appropriation that were repeatedly made.

I feel very deeply about Mr. POWELL's comment regarding the deplorable condition at Freedmen's Hospital.

The gentleman from New York made a very serious indictment of the former administration when he called attention to the horrible conditions existing at Freedmen's Hospital. This was the previous administration's responsibility during the 20 years and a part of the New Deal propaganda to the Negroes that they were their best friends. The Bible says, "By their fruits they shall know them." Those of us who have been here for many years as Members of Congress recognize the fact that Washington is no heaven for Negroes. Unlike my own city of Cleveland, Ohio, there is wholesale discrimination here.

President Eisenhower was inaugurated on January 20—about 4 months ago. Unlike his predecessors, he believes in words and not pleasant conversation. He is not talking for propaganda purposes or newspaper consumption. He is speaking from the heart. Every campaign speech he made last year—every pledge that he made to the American people is being and will be kept. His purpose is to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly.

Emphatically, with my friend the gentleman from New York, Representative POWELL, occupying a front seat on the floor of the House, I want the American people to hear me and to know that while this debate is in progress and since members of the minority party appear to be anxious to make mileage out of what transpires here, we want the record to show that a member of our party speaks regarding performance. Republicans have no apology to make for conditions at Freedmen's Hospital nor at Howard University. We have not been in power for 20 years. The Republican Party was born to set men free, and our greatest objective is to make men free not only here but everywhere throughout the world. Wherever the Republican Party has had an opportunity to demonstrate, we have shown that we place human rights above property rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I arrived on the floor from a meeting of my Subcommittee on Air Force Appropriations just as the gentlewoman from Illinois introduced her amendment, which is now before us.

My interest in Howard University began some years ago when I was a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations on Labor and Security. That school has done a good job in the education of the Negro youth of this Nation.

While I am and have been as ardent an advocate of economy as any Member of this House, I do not feel that supporting this amendment is contrary to my desire or activity for economy.

These funds are an investment in the future of America, and that is a good investment at any time.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, even though I dislike to go contrary to this subcommittee, which has worked on this measure so long, I am going to vote for the proposed amendment to increase the funds for Howard University.

(Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] to close debate.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to open my concluding remarks by referring to the remark of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], and I quote, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, what he said yesterday on the floor of the House:

I have never seen such a flagrant act of discrimination as that perpetrated by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee in cutting out all assistance to land-grant colleges, in cutting the budget of Howard University by 54 percent, and in cutting the budget of Freedmen's Hospital by 18 percent.

Then he went on to say that action was anti-Negro. I wish to state my position very clearly. No one, at any time, has ever accused me of being anti-Negro. No one has ever accused me of being anti any minority group, regardless of what the so-called minority group might be. I have never been associated with any organization of any kind, even on the fringe, of which I would ever be ashamed, or for which I would ever have to apologize. Thinking very seriously over the remarks of the gentleman from New York, I do not believe he intended to imply that I am anti-Negro, because I will stack my record against any Member of the House for tolerance of all groups and all classes of people, all of the time, all through the years. So, with that fully understood, I do not see how anyone could construe the action of the committee as anti-Negro.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] had an exchange of remarks on the ratio of students to teachers. I refer you to page 103 of the hearings. At the committee's request, Howard University put into the record the ratio of students to teachers, from



1948 to 1953. In 1945, the ratio was 15.3 students per instructor; in 1949, it was 14; in 1950, it was 12.4; in 1951, it was 11.6; in 1952, it was 10.2; in 1953, it was 10. I believe the gentleman from New York admitted that the State university's ratio of students to teachers is somewhere between 14 and 18.

I would like to refer you to the committee report for just a moment:

The bill includes \$2,240,000, a reduction of \$510,000 from the request and \$435,000 from the appropriation for 1953. The enrollment at the University has dropped every year since 1948. The estimated gross enrollment for 1953 is only 62 percent of the comparable figure for 1948. The amount provided in the bill is approximately 10 percent more than provided in 1948. Even allowing for increased salaries and other costs this is a liberal appropriation.

I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] covered very well the point that, while the appropriation has been going up every year, the enrollment has been going down every year. There is nothing discriminatory about the cut the committee has made; it is based on these plain facts.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the decrease in the enrollment at Howard University. This follows to some extent the pattern throughout the United States as shown by these figures: In 1949, total enrollment in the colleges and universities was 2,457,000. In 1950, there was a 6.5-percent decrease, the total being 2,297,000. In 1951, there was a further decrease of 7.8 percent, resulting in a total enrollment of 2,116,000. In 1952, there was a slight increase resulting from junior-college increases and the total was 2,148,000. In the same year there was a decrease of 1.7 percent in the universities proper.

Next year it is estimated that there will be a 5-percent increase and Howard University will doubtless share in this. Actually there was an increase in new students at Howard in the current year, indicating that the slump has ended.

The 5 percent estimated increase is based upon three factors, namely, the birthrate decline of 1930-35 will not be felt after this year, there is an increase in percentage of high-school students entering college, and, finally, an added number of Korean war veterans will be entering college.

Mr. Chairman, under the able leadership of Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president of Howard University, the institution is enjoying added prestige and is rendering a great service. Its usefulness should not be retarded by decreased appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. CHURCH) there were—ayes 82, noes 70.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BUSBEY and Mrs. CHURCH.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 113, noes 101.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Office of Education*

Promotion and further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provision of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15), section 4 of the act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), section 1 of the act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30), and the act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462), \$16,048,870: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$15,873,870 for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That none of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 13, line 21, after the parenthesis, strike out "\$16,048,870" and insert "\$18,673,261."

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would restore the funds for vocational training to the same amount as was provided last year.

I must confess that my normal tendencies are toward economy and saving money, and I guess my votes in the House have been about as consistent in that direction as those of any Member. I think the committee has touched one of the nerves of one of our finest and most justifiable Federal programs. The vocational training program in America today, I think, spends dollars to the best advantage of any program I know of in which the Government participates. This program is carried on throughout the United States. It is a matching proposition. The formula under which this money is distributed is a very wise and a very practical one. The Federal Government certainly is not putting anything like one-third of the amount being spent.

The only reason advanced by the committee for cutting the fund is the fact that they say the program has reached maturity. Vocational training is in its infancy in America. Vocational training is about the finest form of education from the standpoint of helping the average boy who is not able to get a college education that we can formulate, and even some of those with college educations find that they, too, must take on some form of vocational training. I have never believed that a man or a woman was educated until he or she knew how to earn a living.

This program has expanded. The more it expands the better America we will have. We try to set our sights a little too close sometimes in figuring on these money matters.

Mr. Chairman, I conducted an investigation to try to find out approximately the amount being spent by the Armed Forces in vocational training. That is,

giving servicemen skilled training, the same kind of training that the vocational programs would give if it reached all of those boys. The best figure I could find indicated that approximately \$135 million was spent for this service-training program and that it is not the well-organized vocational program that we have in our established school systems in America which are the most economically operated of any in the world.

Then I began trying to find out what our foreign-aid bill provided. The point 4 program, a large part of which is purely and simply vocational training for the foreign countries of this earth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARDEN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, in 1952, \$472 million was spent on the point-4 program. In looking for the amount allocated or recommended for 1954 I find the sum of \$453 million. It simply does not make sense to me to appropriate such tremendous sums for programs about which we know so little. And then for the young people of our own homeland, we adopt a penny-pinching policy and chop off 2 million from a small \$18 million program, which covers the whole United States.

Mr. Chairman, the States are doing everything they can do but the program is expanding, it is producing, and it is building a better America. The State of North Carolina for 1952-53 appropriated for this program \$2,500,000 in round figures. The State of North Carolina for 1953-54 appropriated \$3,039,000, which is clear evidence to anyone that the officials of the States are catching the importance of this program and the legislatures of the States are adding to it. But, the trouble is the program is growing; they have more students, they have more schools that are carrying on more work.

I will just use the number of schools, for instance, in North Carolina. There are 1,257 vocational training schools in the State of North Carolina. Now I am going to make another very frank statement. The State of North Carolina will not fall to pieces if the measly \$2 million is cut off the appropriation, but I know in some States this cut that is advocated by the committee will wreak havoc with the program they are trying to carry on. These are the people that we talk about so much when we are running for office that need help so badly. It is the boys and girls in the rural sections, it is the boys in the areas that know at the age of 12 or 15 they will never be able to see the inside of a college door, and yet they want to earn a living and they want to be trained in some school. Therefore, the vocational-training program is the answer to that crying need to millions of boys and girls in this country. Stop and think, with an appropriation of only \$18 million, and then cut it \$2 million



on the theory that the program has matured. I wish that the Federal Government was spending \$100 million on vocational training in the United States of America. If we did that, we would not have to spend over \$125 million to give these boys training in the Armed Forces; they would be trained mechanics, they would be trained wood workers, they would be trained electricians before they ever reached the Armed Forces. So, it is the most economical place to train them. It is the finest place to train those boys and to give them the kind of training we want them to have.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I know the gentleman from North Carolina does not want to misquote the committee. He has said on 2 or 3 occasions that the committee says this program has matured. I think that is a little different than the language of the report, and I quote:

The committee is in agreement with the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary in their belief that this program has matured to the point where its promotion and further development should gradually be turned over to the States.

We have never said it has matured, because we agree it is a wonderful program, and I agree with the gentleman that we ought to have \$200 million.

Mr. BARDEN. There was no intention on my part to misquote. The statement just read is not much different from my statement. The results would be about the same. I do wish the gentleman would agree to put the appropriation back and let it go to this worthy program. If you did not have any more boys than you had 2 or 3 years ago, and if you were not going to have any more students, then you might be able to work it out as you have. But, America is growing, and the students are growing, and the schools are growing, and the need is growing, and I certainly hope the committee will not resist this \$2 million to make the program a normal going proposition. No better money can be spent for the building and defense of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to see how many Members wish to speak on this amendment, and see if we can arrive at some limitation on debate. I see quite a few Members have risen, and I know they have a great interest in this program. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, and to this paragraph, be limited to 1 hour.

Mr. FOGARTY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I know there is a lot of interest in this amendment. I think for the purpose of conserving time and finishing this bill, if the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment I am sure we can save a lot of time.

Mr. BUSBEY. Nothing would please me better if we were not in such a pre-

dicament financially in this Government.

Mr. FOGARTY. Does the gentleman say "On this amendment and all amendments thereto"?

Mr. BUSBEY. On vocational education.

Mr. BAILEY. I object, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment on the desk.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on amendments to this section and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the Chairman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the latter part of the gentleman's motion is not in order. He cannot move to make 5 minutes available to himself.

Mr. BUSBEY. I accept the gentleman's point of order.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOGGS. I wonder if the Chair would make clear just exactly what section the gentleman includes in his motion.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would say to the gentleman from Louisiana I did not say the section, only this paragraph. This amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Just this paragraph.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that I have an amendment on the desk referring to the same paragraph, and I want some time to discuss it.

Mr. BUSBEY. That is not an amendment to this amendment. I am limiting it to this amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. But it affects the same paragraph.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Let us understand what the motion is. I understood the motion was to limit debate to this paragraph and all amendments thereto, to 1 hour. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the question.

Mr. BARDEN. Where does the paragraph end?

The CHAIRMAN. Line 2, page 14.

Mr. BAILEY. I have an amendment perfecting lines 1 and 2 on page 14, which is a part of that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be in order. The gentleman or any other Member can offer an amendment to this paragraph.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be granted to the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment and sincerely hope that it will be adopted.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, those who might be disposed to accuse me of being reckless with the expenditure of Federal funds would have to be excused upon the grounds of ignorance of the record. I think there is no one on either side of this dividing aisle to whom I would have to yield on that score. But on this particular question, and let me say here that I pay very little attention to those cries from special interests and pressure groups, when those pressure groups are composed of adult Americans, but when it comes to the welfare and education of our American children, and I am faced with the knowledge that you propose to spend \$16 million to educate American children during the coming fiscal year in vocational education and at the same time propose to spend \$21,677,000 educating children from all over the globe—Chinese, Austrian, German, Finnish, Iranian, and from wherever you can imagine, then I can conscientiously support the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina to raise the funds that we propose to spend on our own children by at least \$2 million.

One of the most contradictory things I have seen this House do is its action earlier today when this committee voted to increase by \$700,000 the appropriations for an agency whose sole function is to recruit trainees, their secondary function, of course, being to see to it that at least 15 reports are furnished in quintuplicate on each trainee at least 5 times a month. That program has been increased by \$700,000. Here you propose to cut the agency that is charged with the responsibility of training those recruits by \$2 million.

If I had time, I would like to read a statement on this floor from candidate Eisenhower. I have no reason to believe that he has changed his position since ceasing to be candidate Eisenhower, but on September 27, 1952, he said, in part, quoting President Eisenhower:

One of the greatest things about the United States is the fact that it has achieved the highest level of mass education in history. This American system has many unique and variable phases, among the most important of which are the land-grant colleges, the experiment stations, the vocational-education program in high schools, the county-agent system, and the future farmers and 4-H programs.

I am just asking the Republicans to go along with their President and am asking the Democrats to do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized.

(Mr. MOSS and Mr. METCALF by unanimous consent yielded the time allotted to them to Mr. BAILEY.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?



Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by inserting them at the point in the debate on the Fogarty amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from West Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. MOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to give the strongest possible support to the amendment to restore Federal support for an adequate vocational education program. The committee's proposal to cut vocational education funds and eliminate the distributive education phase of the program will make impossible the continuation of a well-rounded system of vocational education.

Adequate money should be provided to help educate those youngsters who are interested in agriculture, trades, and industry, or home economics. Education in these three fields is necessary and desirable, but it leaves a wide gap if we are to make the greatest use of our most important national resource—the human resource. Youngsters in distributive education classes are trained in merchandising, advertising, and the many other jobs that go into retail and wholesale distribution. Training is necessary in agriculture and the trades to equip students to grow or manufacture the products of everyday life. Training is necessary in home economics to assure beneficial use of the manufactured or grown products. Training is just as necessary for those students whose life work will be distributing the products of our farms and factories for use in the homes.

The effect of the proposed reduction in funds for a complete vocational education program will be a reduction in the complete utilization of the Nation's manpower. Persons who could be trained in the fields of distribution would go into those important jobs without the training which will equip them to do the best possible job. Frequently in these Chambers it has been said there should be no waste in Government. I agree wholeheartedly and add that there should be no waste in any of many activities of the people of this Nation. The proposed cut in funds for vocational education would be a waste of our most valuable treasure—the manpower of our Nation.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from North Carolina increasing funds for vocational education and the amendment by the gentleman from Arkansas to remove the prohibition on funds for distributive education.

I appeared before the subcommittee to oppose a cut in the \$18,500,000 recommended in the budget submitted prior to January 20 for State grants-in-aid for

vocational education under the George-Barden Act.

Curtailement of the grass roots vocational education program would be felt in this Nation's high schools, in its industries, in its business houses and on its farms.

We are appropriating, rightfully I believe, hundreds of millions of dollars to extend technical assistance abroad. I believe we can justify expenditure of this small amount to extend technical assistance to our own boys and girls.

Montana is a large State with a small population. Its principal source of income is agriculture—crops, livestock, livestock products. Its principal source of employment is distribution. A large percentage of Montana youngsters live in remote areas and do not attend college or further their education beyond high school. Our educators and taxpayers feel that this situation should be met with a well-balanced secondary education program since there are no trade schools in the State. In this balanced program, vocational education has played its rightful role. It has served the youth of Montana well. It has been geared to local needs.

Many Montana youngsters who would have reached the end of the road in achieving a formal education long before high school graduation have found that vocational education opened a new door for them. Therefore, they have stayed with their schooling, received high school diplomas and followed trades or professions with success.

Half the high schools in Montana now offer one or more of the vocational education courses. Vocational education services now functioning in Montana under competent State and local leadership are vocational agriculture, vocational home economics, distributive and business education, trade and industrial education, vocational guidance, and industrial arts.

In 60 of Montana's 176 high schools, farm youths can prepare themselves for a better life by enrolling in vocational-agriculture courses. Currently, over 2,400 Montana boys are preparing for tomorrow's efforts to increase farm production and to meet the challenge of competition offered by those long established in the field.

That these cooperative part-time work-study programs pay off is evidenced by some figures from Butte, Mont. According to a report published there, about 80 percent of the vocational-education graduates obtain full-time jobs in the kind of work for which they took training in high school.

The high school in Butte, the largest city in my district, also provides statistics showing that only about 40 percent of high-school graduates continue their education. The remaining 60 percent are absorbed into business and industry. These youngsters need the kind of training they get from vocational education.

As the Glasgow Courier put it recently in an editorial entitled "Something To Do":

It is a recognized fact, not only among educators, but among all of us, that an excellent auto mechanic may be a more useful

citizen than say, a poor lawyer. But when a boy or girl starts to seek specialized training in many of the skilled crafts or arts, the youth doesn't find much in this State. Consequently, in eastern and northern Montana, many students have gravitated to such excellent institutions as Dunwoody Institute in Minneapolis or the State School of Science in North Dakota.

It is true that, at Northern Montana College a beginning has been made in such vocational instruction. Eventually, we believe, this will become one of the most widespread and beneficial forms of education in Montana. We hope to see more of it.

I am informed that the total investment—national, State, and local—in distributive education amounts to about \$100 per student per year in Great Falls, Mont. I do not know how much it costs to put a boy in jail. But I know that vocational education keeps up the interest of the school youngster who is earning while he is learning; the interested youngster does not drop out of school; and there is a close relationship between juvenile crime and dropping out of school.

In Montana we have tax-supported State institutions, including a land-grant college, that teach business administration—and where we train young people to manage department stores, wholesale houses and the like. Except for the distributive education program, there is no comparable program for the boys and girls who cannot attend college and whose interests and abilities will lead them to work in the distribution field.

The only thing a youngster, interested in working in a department store, can do without distributive education, is to take his high school diploma and go get a job as a shipping clerk in competition with someone who quit school after the eighth grade, and who has since learned the special skill that qualifies him for that particular job.

Why should not our young people be able to acquire in high school, along with a knowledge of Latin and history, at least the rudiments of the work in a department store, a wholesale house or an office if he is interested in this work?

An impossible feature of this proposed cut, gentleman, is that Montana's Legislature has just completed its biennial session and will not meet again until 1955. Thus Montana cannot revamp our part of the dollar-matching formula to meet the smaller Federal funds available.

This can only result in the cancellation of programs scheduled to begin in many schools and curtailment of those already in operation.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of keeping the record straight.

The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] who offered this amendment is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. He happened to be chairman of that committee in 1946, when this legislation was approved by the Congress. He did not tell you that this public law is what is known as the George-Barden Act. I take it that Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, and Congressman BARDEN are the authors of this



legislation. The gentleman was too modest to even tell his colleagues in the House that he was the author of this legislation. He was the proper one to offer this amendment, because it is a well-established, well-conducted, and worthwhile program.

Just for the purpose of letting you know the kind and type of instruction that is going on under this legislation, I would like to call your attention to the program as it is carried on in the State of West Virginia, where it is one of the best-developed vocational education programs of any of the States in the United States.

I would like to say, prefacing my remarks about the program in my State, the proposed cut cannot be absorbed by the several States without materially reducing the present level of vocational activities being carried on under this program.

As proof of my statement, I would like to call attention to the program in West Virginia, where the overall cost is \$1,728,164, of which the State pays \$231,780. The local school districts, if you please, pay \$1,082,031, and the Federal Government \$414,353.

This reduction has meant a cut in the allocation to the State of West Virginia for this particular instruction of \$57,000.

I was at one time State director of the budget and ex-officio secretary of the State board of school finances. I had to approve and manage the various school budgets, as well as other State and county budgets.

I know there is no place where school boards could find the money at this late date to reimburse the loss that the Federal Government would occasion by making this reduction. Let me remind you that for every Federal dollar expended here there are \$3 of State money. Let me recall, too, that our State legislature has adjourned and that there is no opportunity to get additional funds. But I would like at this time to remind my colleagues of the House that the State Legislature of West Virginia, in an effort to increase and improve this program, the State legislature which adjourned some weeks ago, increased the State appropriation for this program by \$100,000 in the thought that it was a worthwhile program and that the Federal Government might possibly increase the allotment. They certainly did not contemplate that the Federal Government would reduce the allocation because the State had increased its own allocation.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from West Virginia and to extend my remarks in the RECORD following his.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, may I say now briefly that in the State of West Virginia there are 268 high schools; 176 of those 268 are offering 1 or more programs which receive reimbursement from Federal and

State vocational-education funds under this legislation.

Enrollments in high-school vocational classes for the year 1951-52 were: Vocational agriculture, 5,517; vocational home economics, 9,679; trade and industrial education, 3,817; and distributive education, 350; a total enrollment of 19,363.

And here is one thing in particular I would like to call to the Committee's attention.

The boys enrolled in vocational agriculture in 1951-52 conducted supervised farming programs which included crop and livestock enterprises, in addition to farm and home improvement, conservation, and farm mechanics projects. Their productive enterprises had a total value of \$2,014,199. The cost of producing these enterprises was \$1,005,817, leaving a return for their labor of \$1,008,382.

Do you wish to impose a curtailment that would in any way handicap a project that can show profits of that kind and can show what it is doing to train young American boys to stay on the farm, if you please, and to make the farm a better place on which to live?

Let me call your attention to something else: The girls enrolled in vocational home-economics classes in 1951-52 conducted a total of 23,000 home projects under the supervision of their teachers.

The boys and girls enrolled in distributive education classes in 1951-52 earned a total of \$207,000 while employed as a part of their cooperative training program.

A total of 400 high-school vocational teachers are employed in the State in 1952-53. Of these 127 are teachers of vocational agriculture, 134 are teachers of vocational home economics, 125 are teachers of trade and industrial subjects, and 13 are teachers of distributive education.

I would like to join in the plea made by the gentleman from North Carolina that a program of this type; a program that since its inception in 1936 has proved its worth and proved the wisdom of Congress in making appropriations. Let me say to you that the total amount involved here of a little better than \$18 million is the same amount that you have been appropriating for the last 5 years. It is the amount that President Truman approved and it is the amount that Secretary Hobby approved.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, since 1924 the Congress has continuously recognized that the promotion and further development of vocational education in the Nation is in part a Federal responsibility. The various States have proceeded with this phase of their educational program under provisions of several laws passed by the Congress, the last of which was the act of March 18, 1950—Public Law 462, 81st Congress. The States have shown good faith by carrying on and expanding the program as much as possible as the ever-increasing load made constantly heavier demands upon them. Many of them actually went beyond their normal financial ability to support this program.

It is difficult for me to agree with the position taken by the majority party members of the committee in cutting back the appropriation for this purpose from the conservatively estimated requirement of \$18,673,261 to \$16,048,870, a reduction of \$2,624,391, in view of the fact that the need for this type of education is greater now than ever before. This need is emphasized by the defense production effort in the country where greater skills are necessary and more people with those skills are in demand. To cut back at this time, even in the amount proposed, would be, in my opinion, directly in counterpurpose to our national defense program.

We must bear in mind, also, the fact that there are many of the men and women who have been in the Nation's Armed Forces who can avail themselves of its benefit. Even a small curtailment in the amount required could easily militate against them and I am sure that no Member of this House would condone doing that.

To my mind, this is another case of rather shortsighted attempt at so-called economy. When we consider that we are being asked to appropriate billions of our taxpayers' dollars to be sent abroad, some of which will be utilized for exactly this same purpose in foreign countries, it must be clear that the reduction we are asked to make in the funds for this valuable program is entirely unjustified. I sincerely hope, therefore, that this House will recognize the necessity for, and the justice in restoring this item to the full amount estimated to be required for the proper continuation of the program. For that reason I am supporting the Barden amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that thus far in the debate we have increased the appropriations recommended by the Appropriations Committee a total of \$1,409,000. I will not enumerate those items. However, I submit the amendment which we are now considering is of supreme importance and I wholeheartedly support it.

I also call attention to the fact this amendment would only increase the appropriation recommended by \$2,624,391.

May I also make myself clear that I intend to support the amendment which I understand the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] will offer to eliminate lines 1 and 2 on page 14 in order that the restriction on distributive education will not appear in the bill. I consider that phase of vocational education extremely vital.

Mr. Chairman, I dare say I represent the most conservative district in the State of Virginia but if those good farmers in my district who compose the majority of the population had had the opportunity to vote between the additional \$55 million for agricultural payments and this additional amount for educational requirements, I am sure they would have voted for the latter.



Mr. Chairman, let me preface what I have to say by assuring the committee that no one in the Congress is more economy-minded than I. Anyone who has, as I have, worked from his 13th birthday to put himself through school, knows the real meaning of thrift. No one more than I, and all of my private and public utterances will establish the fact, resents and resists the encroachment of socialism. However, I am persuaded that the program of Federal help for vocational education, as administered by our Government since 1917, is not calculated to socialize our educational system, and is economically and morally commendable and justifiable. I have inquired searchingly and painstakingly of my constituents, and I am convinced that the Federal Government is making no effort to usurp or interfere with State administration and control, and is not attempting to influence policy decisions in the execution of the program. In this regard, I want it plainly understood by one and all that if the Federal Government should ever attempt to invade the educational domain of the States, I would then advocate the complete abandonment of the Federal program and the repeal of the Smith-Hughes Act and the George-Barden Act.

As you gentlemen know, the George-Barden Act, which was passed in 1946, authorized the Congress to appropriate up to but not exceeding \$29,300,000 for vocational education, including \$10 million for agriculture, \$8 million for trades and industry, \$8 million for home economics, and \$2,500,000 for distributive education. Since fiscal year 1951, the following funds have been made available for distribution to the States:

#### Fiscal year 1951

From the Smith-Hughes Act... \$7,285,122.03  
From the George-Barden Act... 19,977,760.00

Total..... 27,262,882.03

#### Fiscal year 1952

From the Smith-Hughes Act... \$7,285,122.03  
From the George-Barden Act... 19,123,261.00

Total..... 26,408,383.03

#### Fiscal year 1953

##### BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

From the Smith-Hughes Act  
(permanent appropriation) - \$7,285,122.03  
From the George-Barden Act... 19,123,261.00

Total..... 26,408,383.03

The George-Barden Act figures quoted above include funds made available to Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, District of Columbia, Alaska, and minimum amounts to States as provided by law.

Considering the economy feature involved, it seems to me that a comparison of the total Federal money spent for vocational education in America with the total Federal money spent to aid foreign students in the educational field is quite illuminating. In 1950-51, the United States paid out \$28,178,000.10 to bring 13,069 persons to the United States from abroad for educational training while 3,363,684 students resident in the continental United States, Territories, and possessions obtained only \$27,262,882.03 for vocational education. During fiscal 1951 the Federal Government spent

\$554,400 under the point 4 program to import 264 foreign vocational education students. At the same time, the State of Virginia received only \$626,464 for the vocational education of 147,525 Virginia students. More than 10 times as much money as was spent for all phases of vocational education in Virginia in fiscal 1951 was spent by the Federal Government to import 3,101 students from Germany and Austria.

In fiscal 1952, which ended June 30, 1952, we brought to this country a total of 13,476 foreign students and sent to foreign countries a total of 3,252 American technicians, specialists, teachers, and so forth, all at a total cost of \$49,807,417. In addition to this sum of money, we spent \$171,000 for assistance to American sponsored schools in Latin America, \$65,000 for American participation in the Berlin cultural festival and the Berlin industrial fair, \$15,337 for the Vienna cultural festival, and

\$214,321 under Public Law 402 for operating costs for encouraging, facilitating, and servicing voluntary programs not connected with the expenditure of funds for United States Government grants. Compare this vast sum of money with the sum of \$26,408,383.03 spent on vocational education in the United States and her Territories and possessions.

I am not here to attack the foreign student educational program, but I think that by way of comparison, these facts and figures are significant in considering the economy question involved.

To demonstrate on a comparative basis the need for supporting Federal funds for vocational education, I would like to compare the amount of Federal funds received by each geographical unit of my Sixth District of Virginia during fiscal 1952 with the total amount of money spent in that unit on all phases of the program:

Expenditures for vocational education, 1951-52

County or city (Virginia)	Federal		State	Local	Total
	George-Barden	Smith-Hughes			
County:					
Alleghany.....	\$1,200.00	\$1,000.00	\$7,200.19	\$17,050.31	\$26,450.50
Bedford.....	2,650.00	2,600.00	16,057.31	24,820.18	46,127.49
Botetourt.....	1,500.00	4,100.00	16,251.00	11,494.41	33,345.41
Campbell.....	1,800.00	6,700.00	29,561.23	23,703.39	61,764.62
Craig.....	300.00	1,500.00	5,811.11	4,532.45	12,143.56
Floyd.....	900.00	4,750.00	14,138.41	9,082.23	28,870.64
Montgomery.....	8,049.98		24,215.65	16,461.67	48,727.30
Roanoke.....	3,800.00	500.00	20,399.50	22,332.80	47,032.30
City:					
Clifton Forge.....	602.00		3,842.27	7,528.46	11,972.73
Lynchburg.....	1,041.50	350.00	21,472.51	18,234.95	41,098.96
Radford.....		2,113.10	4,327.30	8,154.16	14,594.56
Roanoke.....	5,931.59	995.35	58,786.78	89,814.30	155,528.02
Total.....	27,775.07	24,608.45	222,063.26	253,209.31	527,656.09

Source: Mr. F. B. Cale, Director of Vocational Education, Virginia State Board of Education, Mar. 17, 1953.

With these funds, the Sixth District of Virginia has done an excellent job. Our teachers are extremely capable people and are dedicated and conscientiously devoted to the science of education. The return on the investment, in terms of individual and community improvement and economic stability, cannot possibly be measured in dollars and cents. However, infinitely more could be done with slightly larger monetary investment. Many of our schools which participate in the program are incompletely staffed and ill equipped, and many of our schools have been unable to participate at all.

If the good farmers of my district, who constitute the major portion of the population of my Sixth District, had had the opportunity to vote between the additional \$55 million for soil conservation and the additional \$2,624,391 for conservation of the vocational education program, I am sure they would have voted for the latter, even though the dollar benefit is smaller.

In conclusion, our view of the economy program must be taken at long range. In looking at the trees we must be careful to see the whole forest, and in looking at the whole forest we must not fail to see the individual trees. What I mean to say is that, in deciding how much we shall spend in fiscal 1954, we must not

lose sight of the ultimate long-range economic benefit to be derived from raising the level of our educational base and the economic opportunities of our citizens. I trust that the committee will see fit to maintain the \$450,000 allocation for distributive education and will maintain the present budgetary recommendations for all phases of vocational education.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the pending amendment.

As a member of the Committee on Agriculture and having the honor to represent in Congress one of America's great agriculture and coal-mining districts, I am asking that the House give serious consideration to the proposed curtailment of funds for vocational education.

I have had an opportunity to observe the excellent results of the vocational education program in my own congressional district.

I believe all the rural people know that vocational agriculture in their rural high schools is meeting a real need of farm families—a need which in no other



way could be met if it were not for this instruction program on a secondary-school basis.

Although the George-Barden Act authorized the appropriation of \$29 million for the promotion and further development of vocational education, the complete authority has never been exercised and the appropriation requested for 1953 is \$18,673,261. This is actually a reduction of \$1,345,000 in the amount appropriated under the provisions of the George-Barden Act for fiscal year 1950-51.

Virginia received approximately \$640,000 this year in Federal funds for vocational education. This is a small portion, approximately 25 percent, of the total amount expended in Virginia for vocational education.

If the amendment under consideration fails, the cuts in vocational education would come to Virginia in the second year of our biennium and, not having a session of the general assembly, we would have no way to restore these proposed curtailment of funds. Individuals and schools throughout the State would be seriously affected.

As an example:

The mine laws of the State of Virginia require that all employees occupying positions of foremen or fire bosses must obtain a certificate of competency before occupying positions of that nature. These examinations are rigorous and require knowledge of underground workings that can be obtained only through experience. In order to assist such persons, who have ambition to advance in their chosen work and improve their earning capacity, courses of instruction have been maintained throughout my congressional district since 1926, providing facilities furnished by the Virginia Trade and Industrial Education Department. This department is maintained by funds appropriated by the Federal and State governments.

The Virginia Coal Operators Association also is a token contributor, and assists the regional director in meeting travel expenses, for which no provision is otherwise made.

Attendance at these classes on the part of the employees is purely voluntary. They receive no compensation for doing so. Quarters for holding these classes are furnished by the various coal companies. The participation in these classes not only enables the men to be better qualified to pass the examinations, but it is also valuable in increasing their knowledge of proper methods of underground work.

Any reduction in the amount of funds appropriated by either the Federal or State governments would curtail to a large extent the continuation of this very important and desirable educational work. This, I feel sure, would be greatly deplored by the executives of the coal companies and by the rank-and-file miners themselves.

In addition to these courses of instruction, the Department also maintains vocational training schools at Wise and Abingdon, Va., where courses in manual training of various kinds are furnished. Participation in these courses is shared,

to a great extent, by high school students who realize the values that accrue through these courses of instruction.

The Washington County Technical School in Abingdon, Va., for the past several months, has been training many hundreds of prospective employees of the Sperry-Farragut plant located near Bristol, Tenn. This important defense plant is nearing completion and will be engaged in producing guided missiles for the Navy. In the next few months the fruition of this training will bloom when these employees take their place on the assembly line.

A reduction in funds for this vocational education facility would certainly curtail this valuable program which is making such a vital contribution to the national defense efforts of this Nation.

President Eisenhower recently asked Congress to authorize a commission to make a study of Federal-State fiscal relations. I highly approve such a study and I am convinced that many interesting and valuable facts will be revealed.

I believe it would be a sound policy to await such a study and give vocational education an impartial investigation along with other grants-in-aid programs, before singling them out in such a manner.

I am a strong advocate of economy, but I do not believe it is sound to effect savings at the expense of the youth of this country and the furtherance of our great productive system of free enterprise—one of the real purposes of vocational education.

I hope that the amendment prevails.

(By unanimous consent, the balance of the time allotted Mr. WAMPLER was given to Mr. ABBITT.)

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to restore the funds for vocational education from \$16,048,870 to \$18,673,261, that being the amount appropriated for this fiscal year.

The greatest assets we have are our young people. The youth of today will be the leaders of tomorrow. The future of our Nation, and the world will depend upon them. We must see that they have the best training possible to equip themselves and develop their capacities to meet this monumental task.

In 1917 Congress passed the Smith-Hughes Act which provides Federal funds for the promotion of vocational education of less than college grade. In subsequent years other acts were approved by the National Congress to further stimulate and develop vocational education of less than college grade.

The last of these acts, which amended and superseded the George-Deen Act, was passed in 1946 and is known as the George-Barden Act. This act authorizes an appropriation of \$29,300,000 for vocational education in the fields of agriculture, home economics, trades, and industry, and distributive education. Congress has never appropriated the full amount authorized.

The maximum amount appropriated for any one year was \$19,977,760 in fiscal 1951. For fiscal years 1952 and 1953 Congress reduced the appropriation in the amount of \$1,304,499. The full reduction was for distributive educa-

tion. This was a reduction of approximately 7 percent.

There was no reduction in the amount of funds appropriated for vocational education in agriculture, home economics, and trades and industry.

The House Appropriations Committee has approved \$16,048,870 for vocational education for fiscal 1954. This is \$2,624,391, or about 14 percent less than the amount made available for fiscal 1953. This, together with the reduction since 1951, will amount to a cut of about 21 percent in George-Barden funds. Such a reduction will result in eliminating the program in many communities and seriously weakening the program throughout the Nation.

#### VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

Appropriations are in the making to increase aid for research in agriculture. This is indeed a wise move. However, we should not lose sight of the fact that research findings are of little value until they are put to use on American farms. Vocational education in agriculture is the only program of agricultural education being operated on an in-school, organized, systematic basis for students of less than college grade. It is through this program that research findings are made known through systematic instruction to future and present farmers. This results in research being put to use on American farms for the benefit of all mankind. It does not seem logical to cut the appropriation for a program that has proved itself over a period of more than 30 years and at a time when we need to step up our efforts to teach research findings to a larger percent of our farm population.

The platform of the present majority party promised the expansion of agricultural research and education. Plans are already under way to increase the appropriation for agricultural research. It would be inconsistent and contrary to the national Republican platform to cut the appropriation for vocational education in agriculture.

There are more than 5,000 high schools in the Nation serving rural people that do not have programs of vocational education in agriculture. More than 1,500 schools need additional agricultural teachers to meet needs. At present, 400,000 youth are enrolled in vocational agriculture in the Nation. There should be 1 million enrolled in order to train a sufficient number of farmers to meet replacement needs. The job in agriculture is only partially done, and yet some speak of withdrawing Federal funds. Let us finish the job and stop talking about withdrawing funds. We need to put more into the program.

The future farmers of America, made up of boys studying vocational agriculture, is one of the Nation's most valuable assets. Through this organization our rural boys are being developed into real American citizens. A cut of Federal funds for vocational education is a cut at the very heart of this program. To preserve this great organization we must see that adequate Federal funds are made available for vocational education.



## DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

America's total civilian employment as of January 1953, was approximately 60 million persons. Of this number, 14,700,000, or 24.3 percent were engaged in distribution, comprising wholesaling, retailing, and service establishments. The distributive trade is the second largest source of employment, exceeded only by manufacturing, which employs 16,600,000, or 27.4 percent.

During the past 20 years, the number of workers in distributive occupations has increased much more rapidly than in agriculture and manufacturing. In the face of this increased employment, it is difficult to understand why the committee has recommended elimination of Federal support to distributive education.

Since Federal aid to distributive education was drastically reduced for the last 2 years, enrollment in distributive education programs has fallen off considerably. For example, the enrollment dropped from 341,440 in 1951 to 234,984 in 1952, a decrease of 106,456. Because of the lack of adequate Federal aid, many States have had to curtail their operations, and reduce staff personnel and the programs offered.

The great majority of distributive-education-cooperative students are individuals who either do not intend or cannot afford to go on to college. This is very important, because these young people in most cases are members of families unable to send them to college.

The distributive-education-cooperative-training program gives them the opportunity of getting practical working experience in their chosen field of endeavor while still in school. It qualifies them to obtain and hold full-time employment, to advance more rapidly on a successful business career.

It is just as important, therefore, that adequate Federal aid be extended to those interested in distribution as to those interested in other vocational areas.

## HOME ECONOMICS

There are two reasons why home economics is so important. About a third of the girls who come out of high school are married within 3 years; in other words, about a third of them are married before they are 20, and they need to have had home-economics education in high school. In their early marriage years the adult homemaking programs, which are being offered increasingly throughout the country, are a great help to them. It goes beyond cooking and sewing. It goes into child care, help in the selection of equipment. Home economics helps these girls who, in increasing numbers, find themselves working even though married. It helps them to do the best kind of a 3-part job—a wife, a mother, and a job outside. That means managing their time and their household and their energy just as intelligently as possible.

For the first time in the history of our country, as you undoubtedly know, more than half of the women who work outside the home are married. Twenty million women are working outside the home and a little more than half of them

are married. About a third of those have youngsters under 18, so they certainly need everything that home economists have to offer on the science and art of homemaking.

The most important values in the business of homemaking are intangibles. All the durable satisfactions of life center largely around the home. Homemaking is a basic industry and education for home and family living is essential to happiness and to progress in our society.

Crime and delinquency costs the Federal, State, and local Governments large sums of money. Not all of crime and delinquency is traceable to unhappy home life, but happy, satisfying home life does much to prevent crime and delinquency. Every individual has an interest in some kind of a home.

Vocational home economics education, as you well know, has had a healthy growth. However, of the 25,484 secondary school centers in this country only some 11,000 have vocational home economics. And nearly 7,000 secondary school centers have no home economics programs. This is evidence surely of a great unfilled need.

## TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION

Vocational education was important in 1918, but never as important as it is right now. The need, particularly in trade and industrial education, is intensified by the rapidly changing pattern of our occupational employment. We are living today in the most highly developed scientific period in world history. We are at the peak of an ever-accelerating development of science and technology which is affecting every aspect of our lives and our occupations. The needs are greater, the problems are more difficult, new types of schools should be developed. It would be a tragic blow to vocational education to lose even a part of the Federal support at this crucial time. The Federal Government must continue to encourage the States by their participation in the program so that this intensified need can be met.

It is vitally important to the Federal Government that trade and industrial education be kept strong and ready for emergency training. We are now in a precarious position. We hope not, but tomorrow we could easily become involved in another worldwide war. The two American planes which were shot down in cold blood during the second week of March are reminders of current and continuing threats to our freedom.

We now have in readiness standby buildings and equipment. We also have standby stockpiles of supplies and materials. But we do not have standby supplies of skilled workers. Education in the trade and industrial field is the only agency with facilities, trained staffs, and technical know-how to train workers quickly, as was demonstrated during World War II, when the vocational schools of this country trained for employment in our war industries 7,469,506 workers. The Federal Government cannot afford to fail to keep this service strong and ready.

A very important reason for continued Federal support is that trained workers

move voluntarily or are moved by the United States Employment Service from State to State for employment. An example of this is the present activity of the aircraft industry on the west coast. Skilled workers either moved voluntarily or were recruited by the Employment Service from all over the country to build a strong aircraft industry so necessary at this time. This must surely be interpreted as an obvious reason for Federal support.

The strength and well-being of America depends on the productive capacity of its people. To be efficient producers, people must be trained. America's vocational program, stimulated and financed in part with Federal funds, has played a most important role in our present position of leadership among the nations of the earth.

We should train people wherever they are so they can find work and produce goods and services wherever they may choose to live.

## MORE STIMULATION NEEDED

The program has not been sufficiently stimulated. There is still much to be done. A cut in Federal funds will definitely mean a cut in the program. The cut of \$900,000 in funds for 1952 resulted in a 197,422 drop in enrollment in vocational education. A cut of \$2,624,391 would doubtless result in a very severe drop in enrollment in vocational education. This should not happen now or anytime. We must continue to do all we can to help our people acquire skills and knowledge that will result in increasing their productive capacity.

The security and well-being of individuals and the Nation is dependent on the skill and productive capacity of the masses of our people. Vocational education is the tool through which our people obtain training that helps them to develop skills and obtain knowledge so essential to production know-how.

We cannot afford, in this period of uncertainty, to weaken in the slightest degree our Nation's program of vocational education. Regardless of what anyone might say, a cut in Federal funds now or anytime would seriously damage the program throughout the Nation and would actually eliminate it in many communities.

## COMMISSION PROPOSED

There is now pending before Congress a bill that proposes to establish a Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations. Such a Commission was recommended by the President. In his message suggesting the creation of such a Commission he stated:

The Commission should study and investigate all the activities in which Federal aid is extended to State and local governments, whether there is justification for Federal aid in all these fields; whether there is need for such aid in other fields.

It seems only reasonable and fair that vocational education along with other State-aided programs be given an impartial investigation—a trial if you please—before summarily cutting the appropriation for the program. In addition to the damage that such a cut would do to the program it would also



tend to prejudice the Commission once it is authorized and appointed.

Vocational education is necessarily costly which makes it difficult for many communities to establish and maintain it on a sound and effective basis. But there is nothing more costly than ignorance. Vocational education is an investment in human progress.

This is the wrong time and the wrong place to make a cut. The damage that would be done to the effectiveness of the program could not be offset by the small amount saved in our efforts to balance the budget.

I think we should pause a long time before we take such a drastic step as this.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this Committee will vote to sustain the Barden amendment.

(Mr. ABERNETHEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Barden amendment. This is one program that reaches practically every State and every community in every State of this entire Nation. We are training boys and girls who may never enter college, who live in their immediate communities, and who work and earn a living for themselves. I think it is one of the greatest programs that we have in this Nation to get people off the dole and to help them help themselves.

So, I certainly hope that this appropriation will be increased to at least the amount appropriated for 1953. Let us cut \$2,000,000 from some other program, or off your foreign-aid program, and add at least this \$2 million to such a worthy cause.

I feel strongly that we should have adequate appropriations for distributive education, and I believe in the equalization of educational opportunities and I believe we should support our land-grant colleges at the national level, but certainly our land-grant colleges should at least have an opportunity to continue until the State legislatures meet.

An amendment will be offered to restore the funds for vocational rehabilitation of the physically handicapped, which I consider to be one of the most important under consideration.

It has been my opportunity to observe first hand the operation of vocational rehabilitation in the States and I sincerely feel that this is the last program that should be impaired by appropriation cuts. It seems that this is one program that everyone would agree should be encouraged. The physically handicapped of this Nation are not candidates for a handout. They do not want charity. Instead they are asking only for an opportunity to work and earn a living like other people. I have personally known many physically handicapped people who would have been without hope had it not been for the program of vocational rehabilitation. I have seen despair turn to hope, and hope to assurance as these same people gained their rightful place in society.

Of course, no one can rehabilitate a crippled person. He must rehabilitate himself. But I know that the State-Federal rehabilitation programs have given many people the opportunity they never could have had otherwise. Furthermore, it is my information that the Government has received \$10 in return for every \$1 spent in rehabilitating physically handicapped people. It comes as somewhat of a shock to me that the committee would recommend less for vocational rehabilitation of crippled and blind adults than the President recommended in his budget.

The Government has spent great sums of money to convert from war to peace and from peace to war to help able-bodied businessmen. Provisions are made for labor, for the farmer, and we have established social security for those who can earn under the social-security program. We spend a great deal of money on rehabilitation of foreign people through our program of foreign aid, and we provide retirement for our civil-service workers. Yet, the physically handicapped are barred from civil-service employment because of not being able to meet the physical requirements. They are nevertheless expected to bear their share of the tax burden.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how any Member who understands this program can favor this reduction and I hope that we will vote to restore funds so essential to the successful operation of the program of vocational rehabilitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

(Mr. LONG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

#### FUNDS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SHOULD BE INCREASED

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the amendment.

I want to speak in behalf of an increase in funds for vocational education. This bill provides for a decrease as compared with our current program in vocational education. Instead we should be increasing our support of this basic work.

We owe much of our progress in agriculture and rural living in recent years to the training our farm boys and girls have received in agriculture and home economics in their local high schools.

Unfortunately this great program has not yet reached all the high schools attended by all farm boys and girls. We should continue a modest increase in our Federal support of these program each year until all of the farm boys and girls have the opportunity to take courses in agriculture and home economics.

And, we must keep this in mind, the more wealthy communities were the first ones to take advantage of Federal aid for vocational education. The communities without vocational education at the present time are our poorer communities. A few million more dollars for vocational education will do more good spent in these poorer communities than the money we are now spending for that purpose.

We should by all means increase our appropriations for vocational education by at least \$2.5 million. An additional investment of this amount in the education of the youth of our land, will pay dividends amounting to millions of dollars for many generations to come.

(Mr. WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD).

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply interested in the legislation that is presently under consideration, and I wish to state that the entire Oklahoma delegation has gone on record urging the Appropriations Committee to appropriate sufficient funds for vocational rehabilitation to enable the State agencies of the various States to work at their greatest possible efficiency. Our State of Oklahoma has done an outstanding work under Voyle Scurlock, director of vocational rehabilitation. The Oklahoma division of vocational rehabilitation has rehabilitated 1,282 individuals, 208 of which were taken directly from relief rolls, saving the State and Federal Government \$182,000 per year in relief costs. The people of Oklahoma are convinced that rehabilitation is the only effective means of making an important inroad on public assistance costs and that rehabilitation is the truly American way to deal with the problems of disability. The Oklahoma house of representatives has already voted to increase State funds for vocational rehabilitation by approximately 80 percent, for 1953-1954, and if the Oklahoma State senate has not already concurred, which I am sure that it has, the action is expected. I do not feel that the funds for vocational agriculture should be slashed. These cuts would affect activities of both the future farmers of America and future homemakers. The cuts in Federal grants, if approved by the Congress, will force local school districts and States to make up the difference or curtail their vocational agriculture and home economics courses.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Barden amendment. In the consideration of this amendment I should like to say to my friends of the majority on the committee that I do not believe that they have a mandate from the American people to cut vocational education to the tune of \$2 million. I realize that the administration has recommended a cut of some \$4 million, but I have a feeling that its right arm knows not what its left arm is doing. The Secretary of Agriculture, who is responsible for one of the great educational programs administered by the Federal Government, through the Extension Service, has advocated increased emphasis on education and research and less emphasis on subsidy programs which cost not millions but hundreds of millions of dollars. That is exactly in line with the proposal of the gentleman from North Carolina here. If we spend thousands for education now, we save millions in subsidies later on.



Mr. Chairman, this is a program which has developed both in industrial and agricultural areas through vocational agriculture, vocational home economics, vocational trades and industries, and distributive education. In my State of Oklahoma we have seen the development of two of the finest organizations that I know anything about, the Future Farmers of America, and the Future Homemakers of America through classroom work and actual work in the homes and on the farm, through a program partially supported by Federal funds which the committee seeks to curtail in this instance. The development of these programs is directly in line with what the Secretary of Agriculture has been saying about expanding agricultural education and cutting down on larger grants for direct subsidies to agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no other program which has done so much for our country at such little cost as this program designed to encourage the vocational training of our young people. The funds involved in this program are insignificant compared to the total budget; and yet, the returns to the people of our country, both direct and indirect, are enormous.

They tell us we should shift the responsibility for vocational education to the States and local communities. I want to point out, however, that this program has grown up as a joint enterprise in which the Federal Government has properly manifested an interest. State laws cannot be changed overnight. Many local communities are not financially able to support a good program or any program without assistance. Unless we appropriate sufficient funds to carry on this program in the traditional manner in which it has been administered, including sufficient funds to allow for normal growth and expansion, we may here today do irreparable injury to one of the finest programs ever designed by the Congress of the United States for the benefit of our people. Most State legislative programs for the next 2 years have already been completed. Many legislatures will adjourn within the next few days and will have no opportunity to take a second look at this matter. In practically all the legislatures, the fiscal program has already been determined and there is no possible chance of having the States make up the big cuts which have been contemplated for this program. In my own State it will be absolutely impossible to carry on this program unless amendment prevails.

The Oklahoma Legislature, which is keenly alert to the needs of our people, has memorialized the Congress "to refrain from reducing the already inadequate amount of funds requested to be assigned to promotion of FFA and FHA programs throughout agricultural sections of the country." The legislature pointed out accurately that the proposal, if adopted, would result in the discontinuance of every FFA and FHA chapter of less than 25 members in the State.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. May I say to the gentleman I am very much in favor of the Barden amendment and intend to vote for it.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has always been for this program.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman and am wholeheartedly in favor of the Barden amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. I wish I had time to go into the details of the extent to which this program has been developed in my own State and district and in the great agricultural area represented by my distinguished colleague from the First Congressional District, where many youthful members of FFA and FHA clubs have distinguished themselves in national competition. Knowing his district, I can well understand why my friend and colleague has always been a supporter of this fine program.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I just want to congratulate the gentleman on his fine presentation. The program in our State is a splendid program also. I shall support the Barden amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program which we cannot afford to curtail. In my State many new applications are pending in the office of the State director. In my district there are 116 programs of vocational education in 57 communities; 6,524 all-day students and 16,360 adults are reached by it; 134 trained teachers are employed.

It is important to note here the work of the Future Homemakers of America and the New Homemakers of America—Negro. There are now 1,991 FHA and NHA members in the third district. Their motto, "Looking Toward New Horizons," is clearly indicative of the work they are doing.

In my district there are 2,308 FFA members in 51 chapters. In 1950–51 these boys had an annual income of \$715,483.29, or an average income per boy of \$310.10.

Mr. Chairman, the interest in these programs is high; the need is great. The dividends in national income, national security, and national morality are immeasurable. I sincerely trust that the House will restore all recommended cuts in these fine programs.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Barden amendment. The vocational-education program should not be curtailed. It should be expanded. There is a great need for it in my congressional district. Permit me to read to this committee a statement made by the legislative committee, Missouri Vocational Association, which appears on pages 583 and 584 of the hear-

ings on this bill. This statement clearly states the need for a continuation of this program. It is as follows:

NEED FOR THE FURTHER PROMOTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRACTICAL ARTS AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN MISSOURI

As taxpayers and citizens we are interested in the elimination of waste and inefficiency in government. We believe, however, that it is not sound to effect such savings at the expense of the youth of this country and our productive knowhow, which is the real purpose of vocational education.

Further, we feel it unwise to curtail our vocational programs at the time when our adversaries are expanding theirs at a rapid rate. It is rather reliably reported that many leaders in the field of vocational education are being taken from the eastern section of Germany into Russia to assist with the expansion of the practical arts and vocational education.

In the final analysis, properly conceived and well-operated programs of vocational education do not cost—they pay. Regardless of its natural resources, if a nation desires to improve its standard of living, it must provide vocational education and technical training for its people. For illustration, Denmark and Switzerland with poor natural resources and good education and technical training have a high standard of living, while on the other hand, Mexico and Brazil with their great natural resources and low education and technical training have a low standard of living, and so it is all over the world.

In Missouri the job of promoting and developing the practical arts and vocational education has been only partially completed. For example, while 18.1 percent of the labor force of Missouri is engaged in agriculture, only 7.4 percent of the high-school youth of the State are receiving training in this area. Too, while 44.5 percent of Missouri's labor force is engaged in industrial and service occupations, only 5.4 percent of the high-school youth are receiving training in this field. Only 13.3 percent of the high schools of Missouri are offering any type of industrial training. Similar circumstances exist in the fields of vocational distributive education and vocational home economics. The rapid increase in the number of enlarged school districts in our State has resulted in a great increase in requests for programs in vocational agriculture, vocational home economics, distributive, and industrial education. Six years ago the local school district was being reimbursed \$1,800 for a program of vocational agriculture. Today the reimbursement for such a program is only \$1,350. As more programs are approved, reimbursement to the local school for vocational education becomes less. As a consequence of this reduction in reimbursement, many local schools have failed to increase salaries in proportion to increases in the cost of living, and many vocational teachers have left the profession for higher-paying jobs in business and industry. These teachers have done better—and the children of the State have been the losers.

In the interest of national defense and economic well-being, in the interest of a balanced manpower in the different occupational areas, and in the interest of the boys and girls of Missouri, we urge that the Federal aid for vocational education be increased if at all possible, but at any rate, maintained at its present level.

Legislative Committee, Missouri Vocational Association: Joseph Castelli, Guidance; H. W. Dahior, Industrial Education; Custer McDonald, Distributive Education; Pauline Garrett, Home Economics Education; E. E. Schmid, Agricultural Education; Tracy E. Dale, State Director of Vocational Education, Consultant; H. H. London, Committee Chairman.



(Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. BELCHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to discuss briefly why I think the proposed cuts in the appropriations for vocational education should be restored. The vocational education program has worked very well in Oklahoma and has been of immeasurable value. I have observed the program for many years and know that it is sound and has been adequately administered.

The strength of the United States among the nations of the world depends upon our ability to maintain a high level of productivity. This will be possible only through increasing the skill and efficiency of the labor force and improve efficiency on the part of business, industry, and agriculture. Naturally, I am quite concerned about the vocational education program in all its phases and especially as it pertains to agriculture, because my district is largely agricultural. No one will question the fact that America's strength among world powers lies largely in its ability to produce food and fiber. American industry is immediately dependent upon American agriculture.

For the past few years, a strong effort has been made throughout the country to keep the boys on the farm. As the business of farming becomes more complex, with all its problems of soil conservation, disease and insect control, machinery maintenance, and business management, early training will encourage young men to stay on the farms because they will be trained for the job. For farm boys who use the home farm as their laboratory and who later plan to attend agricultural colleges, this training in vocational agriculture that they receive in the high schools is an effective way to bridge the gap between the college and the farm.

I have discussed these proposed cuts with our State director of vocational education. He informed me that Oklahoma's vocational agriculture training would be reduced in the amount of \$49,000 and would result in the loss of 35 established departments of vocational agriculture, and would make idle many agriculture buildings and farm shops which have cost the local communities from \$15,000 to \$80,000 each. It would also disrupt the training of 2,730 of our farm people.

The proposed cut would take away \$34,000 from our State's home economics program. This would result in a loss of 56 reimbursed departments, affecting 5,000 or more students.

Our State director also informed me \$33,000 would be taken away from our trade and industrial education program, which would result in the loss of 50 reimbursed classes, affecting 750 trainees in 25 centers.

School statistics show that the States of this country spend many millions of dollars each year to provide college educations for just 15 to 20 percent of the Nation's youth. The other 80 or 85 per-

cent of the young people who do not go to college must fall back on vocational education for some training for the vocation in which they will find their usefulness. At the present time in our educational setup, only vocational education is designed to meet their needs. I agree with Mr. C. H. Miller, Kansas State director for vocational education, when he said recently:

Society will pay for the training of skilled hands, whether it pays in the orderly, efficient, and satisfying arrangement of cooperation between school and industry, or whether it pays in the more expensive and less satisfying arrangement of allowing youth to get its training in the haphazard, catch-as-catch-can plan of entering industry untrained.

Since I have been a Member of Congress I have been doing everything I could to bring economy into our Government. I think it is the desire of all good citizens that our Government operate economically, that unnecessary expenditures be discontinued, and that taxes be reduced if they can be reduced without curtailing services that are absolutely vital to the future of our country. Gentlemen of this Committee, I consider a strong vocational educational program vital to the future of our country. I ask that you give this matter your most serious consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, may I point out that the committee bill calls for \$2 million more for vocational education than was recommended in the revised budget. I think that item has been overlooked. We are still faced with the responsibility of following the President in his attempt to balance the budget of the United States. The Appropriations Committee, however, saw fit to increase the appropriation for this item for vocational education \$2 million over the revised request. The revised request was \$14,048,000. The committee recommends in this bill \$16,048,000, an increase of \$2 million over the budget under which the Appropriations Committee was working.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. There is a lot of talk about supporting the Eisenhower program and reference has been made to some of his speeches. Would not the gentleman conclude that probably the recommended figure was what the Eisenhower administration indicated at the moment they wanted?

Mr. BUDGE. In answer to the distinguished majority leader, I would certainly have to say that would be my impression.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, it is true that the new administration, in submitting its revised budget to the Appropriations Committee, recommended a cut of 25 percent in the amount of George-Barden funds to be available for fiscal year 1954. In the justification which was submitted by the Budget Bureau, it was pointed out that State and local government is now paying 80 percent of the cost of this program, and it was the feeling of the Budget Bureau that more of this program should be made the responsibility of State and local government. Every dollar of Federal aid we receive in Wisconsin costs the Wisconsin taxpayer \$2.87.

It is my understanding that the Council of State Governments is working on the program to shift more of the responsibility for this type of an aid program to the various States in the hope that within the next 2 or 3 years, we shall be able to give up certain fields of taxation which the Federal Government has taken over almost exclusively.

I certainly am well aware of the fine work that has been, and is being done under the George-Barden program. For fiscal year 1953, the Congress appropriated \$18,673,261. The so-called Eisenhower budget, which was submitted to the Appropriations Committee for fiscal year 1954, provided for a recommended appropriation of \$14,048,870 as a Federal contribution for the promotion and further development of the vocational education program. The Appropriations Committee, however, recommended in the bill before us today an appropriation of \$16,048,870, or an increase of \$2 million for fiscal year 1954 over and above the recommendations of the present administration.

I rise in support of the Appropriations Committee report as I feel that it is a fair and just compromise. I supported the \$2 million increase over the recommendations made by the Bureau of the Budget when this matter was considered by the full committee. I urge the Members of the House today to support the action of the Appropriations Committee in regard to this particular appropriation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, as you will note on page 433 of the hearings, the National Farmers Union has supported and do now support this entire appropriation. In other words, they back Mr. BARDEN's amendment. On page 461 of the hearings the American Farm Bureau Federation also declared their support of the full appropriation. The National Grange, through Mr. Saunders, on page 450 of the hearings declared their support of the full appropriation. I feel that here is one spot in the bill which it would be extremely foolish to decrease below what we have had in fiscal year 1953 and previous years.

I served 6 years on this particular subcommittee in the past and this item, together with the one the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] just mentioned—vocational rehabilitation—are two of the proposals in the bill which I do not agree should be decreased and which I think should be reinstated to the level of 1953 fiscal year.



The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I dislike the necessity of rising to go against the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. If there is anybody in this House I have respect for, it certainly is that man. The only reason I do so is because of the fact I have become acquainted through past association with the program of vocational education, as it exists in my own State. I was a member of the Arizona Board of Public Welfare at one time. I know that the program of vocational education is necessary not only in that State but in all others. We have children coming out of our high schools who are not prepared to make a living, and the colleges are not expanding enough to support and take those children in to teach them other trades. It is absolutely necessary that this program not only continue at its present rate, but that it be expanded. As to vocational rehabilitation, I would like to address myself to that section for a few moments. I know of my own knowledge that the reduction in the public-welfare program in Arizona, and the reduction of the people who have been on the rolls, has been largely due to the very fine vocation rehabilitation program which has been going on in that State. It is not only a program which pays in human dividends, but it pays in dollars and cents. It removes those people from the welfare rolls, and makes responsible and productive citizens of them, and is in all ways a benefit to our American society.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, when unanimous consent was obtained by the gentleman from Illinois to limit time for debate, the Chairman was advised that I proposed to offer an amendment to the same paragraph—not an amendment to the pending amendment but an amendment involving the same paragraph. Will it be possible after this vote is taken and the matter is disposed of to offer that amendment in the same paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it will.

Mr. BAILEY. It can be offered then as a separate amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. As soon as this matter is disposed of, your amendment can be offered and acted upon.

Mr. BAILEY. My amendment, or in case some other Member desires to offer an amendment, it would be in order to do so?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUDGE. When the Chair ruled on the question raised by the gentleman from West Virginia, does that mean that the limitation of time would not apply? The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] said he had an amendment to this paragraph. There was a limitation of debate on this paragraph. Was the Chair's ruling to change the time limitation on the paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The time limitation is not changed. The question comes on the amendment, and then the gentleman may offer his amendment.

Mr. BUDGE. Within the same time limitation as now fixed?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Within the time limitation fixed.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which the gentleman from West Virginia may offer be read at this time in order that it may be debated during the course of the time limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. That can be done. The Chair understands the gentleman from Arkansas intended to offer an amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, what I asked was a clarification, if the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] would be permitted to offer this as a separate amendment after the Barden amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Would the amendment then be subject to additional debate?

The CHAIRMAN. Only within the hour that has been fixed. It can be offered and a vote taken.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Barden amendment, and I also intend to support the amendment on the part dealing with distributive education.

In my State the vocational training program has been an excellent and successful one, and is growing, it needs to be expanded.

I am as interested in economy as anyone, and I know this Congress has a very difficult job in trying to balance the budget, but I think we should use wisdom in our efforts. To me, to try to practice economy on this program is being pennywise and pound foolish, because I do not believe there is any place in the Federal budget where the American taxpayer stands to get as much for his money as he does on this program. I do not think it is real economy to curtail a program that does as much in human and actual cash values as vocational training is doing. If we cut down on this program now when it is growing and when it is so badly needed, we are going to deny the existing generation the training it must have.

Young minds cannot wait for politicians to make up their minds. I think the time to go ahead with a program that is so well approved is now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the Barden amendment. Ever since I came to Congress I have advocated Federal aid to education. In fact, I have always felt that Congress should assume the responsibility in equalizing educational opportunities insofar as guaranteeing a minimum foundation program to all the girls and boys in this Nation.

I am glad to witness so much warm support to restore the 14-percent cut the committee made from the amount of money expended for vocational education for fiscal 1953. The original budget provided for \$18,673,261, the revised, \$14,048,840 and the committee recommended a little over \$16 million. Unless the amount provided for in the original budget is restored, the whole program throughout the Nation will be impaired.

I am sure that the membership of this body cannot afford to throw a monkey-wrench into such an efficient program that assists the States to pay for vocational-guidance teachers to teach high-school children trades that will be useful to them in later life.

Unless these funds are restored there will be no funds for teaching distributive education, and the other three types of training—home economics, trades and industry, and agriculture—are affected. I am sure there is not a Member in this House that objects to our Government paying teachers who work with the future farmers of America. Likewise, the girls and boys who are unable to go to college should not be denied the opportunity to be taught some vocation or trade in high school.

In reality the funds for this program are entirely inadequate.

I noticed out in the reading room a few moments ago where there was a ceremony held today at the White House. President Eisenhower used several pens in signing the offshore giveaway oil bill. What type of economy is this Nation interested in?

Mr. Chairman, I have stated before in this Chamber that our schools throughout the Nation could have been placed in first-class condition with the income from the offshore oil.

A vote to restore the George-Barden funds is a vote for sound economy. Like wise, a vote to restore funds to the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation is a vote for economy. Real economy is simply an intelligent and frugal allocation of available funds to essential uses.

(Mr. PERKINS and Mr. McCARTHY asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the Barden amendment and also the amendment which will be offered I understand by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE]. His amendment proposes to remove from the bill the first two lines on page 14 which



now provides that none of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations. I think we should remember at this point that in the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture the Secretary requested and was granted an increase in funds for marketing research which is, really, a study in distributive education. It is my personal feeling that it would be much better to spend those funds here in distributive education than to have them spent by the Department of Agriculture in research in marketing, if we must make the choice between the two.

A report that I have from the State of Minnesota in regard to occupational and vocational teachers I think is very strong evidence in support of these full appropriations and the removal of lines 1 and 2 on page 14.

I urge the House to grant full and adequate appropriations for the support and expansion of the vocational educational program. Although the form of Federal support of vocational educational programs has changed through the decades of our national existence, the practice goes back to the very beginning. As early as 1779 the Federal Government undertook a program of instruction for those who served in the military forces of our country, and since that time the practice has been continued and extended to include instruction in practically all fields. The need for additional education in the vocational field was clearly evident after World War II and was recognized in setting up the GI educational program. The fact that so many young men and women accepted the chance to receive vocational training, following their discharge from the armed services, is, I think, evidence of the need for an expanded program. There is good reason to believe that if an adequate vocational program had been available in the secondary schools attended by most members of our armed services previous to their entrance into service, the numbers who received training under the GI bill might have been greatly reduced, and their reabsorption into the economy of the United States facilitated.

The vocational training program, in the trades and industries, in vocational agriculture, distributive education, and home economics has been widely accepted in Minnesota. The program has worked successfully in the schools of Minnesota and in my home city, St. Paul, especially, in the latter case, through the St. Paul Vocational School, a public trades school founded in 1919.

The large industry in St. Paul is highly technical and scientific, requiring skilled and trained operatives and craftsmen. In addition, St. Paul is a commercial city, a center of the building trades, and of small manufacturing and assembly plants. The specialization, diversity, and technical nature of much of our employment make vocational training especially necessary. Officials in charge of the vocational education program advise me that there has been a great increase in the number of persons requesting vocational training, especially since

World War II. The apprentice and journeymen training programs alone have accommodated over 25,000 students since 1945. Without Federal funds, they inform me, this program could not have been carried on. The St. Paul and Minneapolis area has been a principal source of building trades and construction workers for the defense projects of the Nation, especially for those projects intended to guard the cold, northern approaches to our country.

In Minnesota the total employed by major occupation groups increased from 928,899 persons in 1940 to 1,143,872 persons in 1950, a percentage increase of 23.1. During the same period the total population increase was only 6.8 percent. The increase in professional workers was 28.7 percent, or about the same as the percentage increase in the number of persons employed. In the same period, however, clerical and kindred workers increased by 53.4 percent, craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers by 60.5 percent and operatives and similar workers by 57.7 percent. Under such circumstances, the present program is not adequate even for the training of replacements, and it does not begin to provide for training to meet the greatly increased demand for technically trained clerical and industrial and distributive workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] is recognized.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, in supporting the Barden amendment I concern myself not so much with the amount of money which the committee proposes to cut but I concern myself with the report of the committee in which it makes the statement that this program has now matured to the point where it can gradually be turned over to the States. I wonder if in not supporting this Barden amendment, I go along with what the committee had recommended we might not be embarking upon a policy of removing the very vitals out of the vocational-education program. It reminds me of a story which all of us have heard which, nevertheless, will bear repeating. A youngster down home was out fishing and pulled in a catfish. As he held the line dangling before him and reached up to grasp the wriggling fish he said: "Hold still, little fish, I'm not going to do a thing to you except cut your head off and gut you." That is about what the committee proposes when they say we should turn this vocational-education program back to the States. They are taking out the vitals of it. Of course, I do not think they are going to collapse in Georgia, but already we allocate more than 50 percent of our income to education, but we will stop the education the boys and girls in this whole Nation have a right to participate in.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his splendid statement in behalf of this amendment.

(Mr. LANDRUM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. SCHENCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to be closely associated with vocational education for many years. Dayton, Ohio, 1 of the 3 largest cities in my congressional district, has long been known as a pioneer in vocational education, an important part of which is distributive education. Each of the other 2 large cities in the Third Ohio District, Hamilton and Middletown, also have big and important vocational-educational programs and programs of distributive education. Many of the township schools feel that their vocational-education portions of their school programs are of special importance to their students.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has long been a recognized educational truism that "we learn by doing." Every part of our educational program is important to every boy and girl in our great Nation. It is recognized, however, that all our schools have a very real obligation to these students to not only give them the necessary cultural and social background for living but that they must also be given proper opportunities to learn the practical skills and abilities to better earn their livelihood.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Barden amendment should be adopted—that the schools throughout our land should be notified that they must soon bear the entire cost of their operation through State and local taxes, and that another amendment which I am advised will be offered should also be approved. That amendment will strike from the bill any prohibition against the use of these funds for distributive education and certainly distributive education is a very important and proper part of any program of vocational education.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

(Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. LANHAM addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time allotted me I shall not attempt to cover again the value of this program nor do I have time to describe the splendid work done by this program, but I would like to direct my remarks to what you would do if you go along with this committee and should not adopt the pending amendment as I pointed out in general debate yesterday.

These funds are granted to the States for the operation of vocational work in schools scattered all over the United



States where the programs are run locally. Every State, almost without exception, and there are only a very few exceptions, participates in this program. The committee says that this is the beginning of giving back to the States this job of vocational training. I do not agree with that. I believe in the equalization principle; but if it be the purpose to pass this job back to the States, it would be sending the matter back to the States before they are in a position to take it up. The State legislatures are not now in session, most of them will not be until next January at the earliest, and many of them a year after that; so if you agree with the stated objective of this committee to put this program back on the States, certainly you should not do it before they have any chance to take up the slack and to take it over. I want to say again that I differ with that objective.

For a given period, so I am advised, we had about 300,000 boys returned from Korea that had gone into the military services from the farms, of which only 75,000 returned to the farms. Fifteen percent of the American people on our farms are feeding all the rest of it. With the shortage of labor in this day and time, if there ever was a need to give specialized training to American youths and to insist and to urge them to stay on the farm, now is the time. To follow the shortsighted policy of this subcommittee, whose intentions are the best, and cut out a substantial part of this fund, to take such funds away from the local schools when they have no chance to remedy the situation, is awfully shortsighted in my opinion. I trust you will adopt this amendment. I understand the subcommittee will restore the funds for land-grant colleges.

[Mr. FOUNTAIN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I know of no program of education that has been more successful or provided greater opportunity for young people to provide for a livelihood than the vocational education program. It is one of the better forms of assistance that the Federal Government grants to the States. In my State it has been most successful and filled a gap which regular institutions were unable to fill. If it has been administered in other States as well as it has in the State of Utah then it is a program of which we can all be proud.

Now I share with the other Members of this body the fear that if the Federal Government continues to drain the tax dollars out of the States there will not be sufficient money left for them to carry on the functions which the States should be carrying on themselves. But until we do completely turn these functions back to the States we should continue to support them until the legislatures of the various States can appropriate the necessary funds to take them over. Let us not cripple them out of

existence. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge this committee to support this amendment increasing to \$18,673,000 the appropriation for vocational education. Both industry and labor are acutely aware of the necessity to provide adequate funds for vocational education in order that we may maintain and further develop the industrial strength of our country.

The attitude of both industry and labor is reflected in the correspondence which I have received from the Building Trades Employers' Association, which includes a joint resolution, as well as a letter from the director of the United Steelworkers of America, District No. 28, and I will request permission to have them inserted with my remarks:

BUILDING TRADES  
EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATION,  
Cleveland, Ohio, May 15, 1953.

Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FEIGHAN: Present recommended appropriations of the Bureau of the Budget have obviously singled out vocational education for a drastic cut of almost 25 percent. If this appropriation is approved, vocational education in Ohio and in other States will be dealt a blow from which it may never recover.

It seems to make little sense to recognize the soundness of the Bureau of the Budget's recommendation to increase the appropriation of the Bureau of Apprenticeship to enable further promotion of apprenticeship and to curtail the operation of vocational education, the latter which is called upon to actually give the training in the public schools.

We heartily urge you to take a determined stand against any cut in appropriations to support vocational education in the States. Ohio stands to lose 35 percent (\$90,000) in support from the Federal Government of vocational education if present recommendations of the budget are approved. Your staunch support to prevent this curtailment in vocational education to youth and adults in Ohio will be greatly appreciated and recognized.

We cannot stress too strongly the importance of the continuance of the apprenticeship program to the city of Cleveland and surrounding territory.

Cordially yours,

JACK BURNS,  
Executive Manager.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF DELTA CHAPTER, IOTA LAMBDA SIGMA AND NORTHEASTERN OHIO TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Whereas it is obvious that recommended appropriations of the Bureau of the Budget have partially singled out vocational education for a reduction of 24 percent thereby

reducing by 35 percent—\$200,000—of Federal vocational funds to Ohio; and

Whereas a recommended increase in funds for the Bureau of Apprenticeship, Department of Labor, has been made by the Bureau of the Budget despite the fact that vocational education in the public schools operates instructional programs for apprentices which are merely promoted by the Bureau of Apprenticeship; and

Whereas it is self-evident that a reduction of vocational education funds as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget will deal a crippling blow to the education and to the extension of educational opportunity of youth and adults in the public schools of the State and the Nation; and

Whereas it is recognized that the partial treatment inherent in the recommended cut in vocational education appropriations is the harbinger of gradual, year-to-year reductions approaching the elimination of Federal funds; and

Whereas a program of organized public vocational education has contributed to a major degree to the education and to the extension of educational opportunity for youth and adults in the United States since the passage of Federal legislation in 1917: It is hereby heartily

*Resolved*, That Ohio representatives in the United States Senate and House of Representatives be made cognizant of this impending catastrophe to the support of vocational education in the States, and that Ohio representatives wage an all-out fight on the floors of the Senate and/or the House to prevent any cut in the vocational education appropriations; and further, it is

*Resolved*, That all friends of vocational education in the public schools, in industry, business, agriculture, and home making support this resolution to their utmost and make personal and collective appeals and protests to their representatives in the Congress.

Adopted this first day of May 1953, at Kent, Ohio, for the two organizations.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,  
DISTRICT No. 28, CIO,  
Cleveland, Ohio, May 20, 1953.

Hon. MICHAEL FEIGHAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I just learned that the appropriation for the Bureau of Apprenticeship in the Department of Labor, has been sharply reduced by the House Appropriations Committee. Because of our organizations' deep interest in and concern with the training of skilled workers in this country, I inquired as to the effect such a cut would have on the Bureau of Apprenticeship's activity. This Bureau is, as you know, responsible for promoting and developing programs for skilled-worker training in all industry.

My inquiries brought out some very interesting facts that I should like to pass on to you. The staff of this agency was reduced in 1952 and again in 1953 and in President Eisenhower's request of this year. The agency has not asked for increased funds, but has consolidated its organization to the point where it asked only this year, for a bare minimum of operating funds.

In President Eisenhower's state of the Union message, I remember hearing him state forcefully, his intention to improve and increase programs for the training of skilled workers necessary for a strong economy. He further stated that training of workers in industry should be promoted and stimulated by the Department of Labor; in this case, the Bureau of Apprenticeship, because it is the agency responsible for promoting this training. I learned that the reduction in budget of more than one-half million dollars out of a \$3,300,000 budget, would cause a reduction in staff of about



100. Such a reduction would mean closing offices and reducing an already slim staff to the point where the services of the Bureau would be seriously affected.

I work with the Bureau of Apprenticeship people quite a lot, and I most certainly do not want to see the services they provide us reduced to even the slightest degree.

It will be deeply appreciated if you will contact any and all members of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees and inform them of our strongest opposition to this cut. I urge that you do so immediately, because the final vote may occur at any hour. We need the services of this agency, and we feel very strongly that important service to industry will be seriously damaged, if this reduction is permitted to stand.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. DONOVAN,  
District Director.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlemen from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, but due to the parliamentary situation it cannot be presented at this time. However, at the proper time I will submit it. It is an amendment to strike out lines 1 and 2 on page 14.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Barden amendment is adopted, but whether or not it is adopted I think it is a grievous error to insert this language in the bill. We have a ludicrous situation if this language is allowed to remain. A boy in high school, for instance, wants to take up vocational agriculture; the boy right in front of him wants to take up a trade in an industrial course, but across the aisle from him there is a boy who wants to take distributive education, in the selling field, and with this language in the bill those three children in the high school will not have the same opportunity. I cannot for the life of me figure why it is in here, because it takes out at least one-fourth of the opportunities of the boys and girls.

As a cold-blooded economy matter, if you are talking about economy, we have in this distributive education in Arkansas 1,821 boys and girls.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

(Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. HALLECK.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to make a statement as to the program for the balance of this week as best I can see it, and for next week.

I had hoped very much that we might conclude this bill this evening. A number of Members are going out to Yucca Flats tomorrow, and I am glad they are going. I think it is a splendid thing that they have an opportunity to see one of these atomic explosions. My only regret is that I have not been able to get out there.

In any event, there are 14 amendments pending at the desk. I do not know how many more amendments Members might have that they would want to offer. As to those at the desk, I might say parenthetically, every one I looked at is to increase the amounts carried presently in the bill, which might indicate some lit-

tle controversy about them. I know in respect to many of them there will be very much controversy. In all probability, I might say maybe it is even beyond a matter of probability, there will be a number of rollcall votes on some of these amendments. There is also the possibility that there will be a motion to recommit on which we might have a rollcall, and there might also be a rollcall on final passage.

In the light of all of that, it is quite apparent to me that we would have to work very, very late tonight in order to finish. Since we have come in at 11 o'clock this morning, and most of us have been very careful in our attendance here, it seems to me that that is not the better part of wisdom. This time will run on, and since there are about 15 minutes of debate left on this paragraph that means we will go on here to about 4:45. I do not know what the next amendment might be. We might dispose of another amendment this evening. Then it would be my suggestion that we adjourn over until Monday at 11 o'clock.

Monday is District of Columbia day. I have checked with the committee. There are several bills that are out of the committee, but I am informed there is no particular controversy about them. I wonder if any members of the District Committee on the other side would give any different indication in respect to that.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will yield, I might say there are a number of bills that have been reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia, but there is no controversy we know of at this time on any of the bills reported and that will be up for consideration on that day.

Mr. HALLECK. That would indicate, then, that we could go on with the consideration of this bill on Monday. Certainly we should be able to dispose of the amendments at some reasonable time Monday evening. It is my understanding that the Members who are going to Yucca Flats expect to get back in Washington Monday night. It might well be, therefore, that we could arrange to come in at say 11 o'clock on Tuesday. I recognize that in these earlier meetings we sometimes run counter to the activities of the committees. However, we are faced with a situation here that does require something maybe a little out of the ordinary, and it would be my idea that the rollcalls on amendments and on the passage of this bill could go over until Tuesday.

I understand the civil functions appropriation bill is to be reported. We expect to take it up for general debate on Tuesday after voting on the present bill is disposed of. It would be my hope that we could conclude general debate on the civil functions bill on Tuesday and read the first section. If we did that, then we would have Wednesday and Thursday to consider that bill under the 5-minute rule and bring it up for passage on Thursday evening. It is our further hope that since the following Saturday is Memorial Day, we could adjourn over from Thursday until Mon-

day in order to give Members a chance to get home for Memorial Day or to make speeches that they may already be committed to make at that time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. I realize the position that the leadership is in at this time. But I know there are two amendments to be offered which I think are important. I know there are several Members who have arranged to take this trip tomorrow to witness the atomic explosion. These Members are vitally interested in the amendment for hospital construction and vocational rehabilitation. If we continue the reading of this bill on Monday, I know they are going to be disappointed because they will not be here and will not have an opportunity to take part in the debate and have an opportunity to vote in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HALLECK. I am sorry that sort of situation prevails. Of course, their remarks could be extended, but I realize that might not be a very satisfactory way of taking care of the problem. But I might also say, for whatever it is worth, that my understanding is that the Members who are taking this trip are divided 50-50 between Democrats and Republicans alike. I do not mean to intimate by bringing that out that there would be any partisanship in their voting on any of these matters. I am sure they would probably rise above that.

Mr. FOGARTY. I hope they would rise above partisanship on this issue. I hope the Republicans will vote for it.

Mr. HALLECK. It might be worthwhile to note that many of these economy measures are pretty well supported here, and some not so well on the other side. But I do not want to get into that. If I understand the suggestion of the gentleman correctly, it is that we might put this over until Tuesday. But if we do that, in my opinion, we cannot conclude the civil functions bill by Thursday night, and that would interfere certainly with the personal convenience of a great many Members who have made their plans for Memorial Day.

Mr. FOGARTY. How about the House meeting at 10 o'clock Tuesday morning?

Mr. HALLECK. If we met at 10 o'clock on Tuesday, we would have a quorum call the first thing in the morning, and I do not believe we could dispose of this bill, and leave any time for general debate on the Civil Functions bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Perhaps if we met early, we would have time for reading the bill under the 5-minute rule on Tuesday.

Mr. HALLECK. May I just say to the gentleman that from my observation of how this debate has progressed today, and after having seen some of the amendments at the desk, I just cannot see any reasonable manner in which to handle this situation except as I have outlined it although I do want to say I understand thoroughly what the gentleman from Rhode Island is bringing out.



Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I hope what the distinguished majority leader has said with respect to the vote on the civil functions bill coming on Thursday does not represent any definite commitment because it had been our intention to bring that bill to the floor on Tuesday and have general debate on it. We hoped we would be able to bring that bill to a vote by Wednesday evening.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that so far as I am concerned, I shall be glad to cooperate with him in the accomplishment of that purpose of having a vote by Wednesday evening. But to undertake to determine at this time, and say that we could read the bill and dispose of all the amendments, and dispose of the bill in 1 day, I just would not want to go on that presumption at this time.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Because of the previous atomic experiment being delayed, there was some delay in the Members getting back. Would it be possible to assure those of the 120 who are going on this trip tomorrow that if there should be some slight delay so that the planes returning came in here sometime Tuesday, then the civil functions bill will be taken up and the record votes then held over until the next day as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] would seem to want the civil functions bill gotten through as quickly as possible.

Mr. HALLECK. That same question was raised a week or so ago. I just do not believe I could, in good conscience, having regard to the overall convenience of the membership and the commitments made for Memorial Day, make any such agreement, because it might involve us in tremendous difficulty. I understand the last time there was a delay of 3 days. Of course, if we undertook to put this off for that length of time we would be in trouble. However, I will not foreclose that possibility. I will certainly cooperate with the minority leader [Mr. RAYBURN] and do everything I can to protect the convenience of the Members, as long as it does not run counter to the convenience of a greater number.

Mr. FOGARTY. How about meeting at 10 o'clock on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday?

Mr. HALLECK. I may say to the gentleman if he had taken some of the rather outspoken suggestions that I have had from committee chairmen, it does not strike me that that would be a feasible solution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] has an amendment which he wishes to offer after the pending amendment is disposed of.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized to close debate on the Barden amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I assure the membership that no one in this House has a higher regard for vocational education, or realizes its value more than I do. My very dear and intimate

friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], whom every Member of this House holds in high esteem has much to be proud of as the father of this legislation. We all share with him the view that this legislation is good legislation, and that the vocational education program is a very worthwhile program.

However, I do want to set the record straight on one thing. Many of the Members who have spoken previously on this legislation have made a great plea not to cut below the Eisenhower budget. This item was raised above the Eisenhower budget by \$2 million; so do not think the committee has cut the President's budget for this item. We have raised it \$2 million.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. Not at this time, I am sorry.

This moderate cut that the committee has made in vocational education means what? It means 83 cents per student. That is what the cut would amount to—83 cents per student.

It is not that we should not have money for this program. The gentleman from North Carolina said he would like to see this program have \$200 million. So would I. But that money should come from the States. The reason the committee made this token cut was to see if we could not eventually get this program back to the States, where they would handle it themselves. In most cases, the States are more able to handle it than the Federal Government. As you know, the Federal Government is fast approaching bankruptcy, while some of the States do not have a single penny of bonded indebtedness, and have large surpluses in their treasuries. That is the question before the House.

Oh, sure! They say, some of the State legislatures have adjourned; that is true. But the same argument will be heard next year, and the following year, and the year following that. When are you going to get this program to the States; where it eventually belongs? The committee thought that, by making a small token cut this year and similar small reductions in future years, the program and the financing of the programs could gradually be placed entirely at the State and local level, where I believe the people really want it.

We are trying to break down this terrific centralization of government, little by little, without hurting any good program, such as the vocational education program. This token cut will not hurt the program.

I hope the amendment is not agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUSBEY) there were—ayes 123, noes 61.

So the amendment was agreed to.

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, in considering the appropriation bill before us

today, let us give some extra thought to the provision for funds to the National Institutes of Public Health in their medical research efforts.

The public health facts and figures easily accessible to all illuminate the acute need in our country today for the most astute medical minds to continue the research work which will alleviate or eradicate the many illnesses prevalent among our people. It is a fortunate home which has not been touched by cancer, heart disease, the crippling disorders of arthritis and rheumatism, mental illness, or other enemies to our Nation's health and economy.

When we are considering this request for research funds, we should remember that scientists have not only spent many dollars in securing their education and skill, but they have given up much of their personal freedom, laboring in the obscurity of the laboratory. It is imperative that we do our share also by granting the funds needed to maintain the services of these well-trained assistants. Sensitive instruments, up-to-date equipment, and modern facilities have also to be supplied as without them progress is delayed and perhaps even paralyzed.

It is unfortunate that most human beings are apt to remain apathetic until the danger strikes at home. We in Congress know that hundreds of lives might be saved if adequate funds are allotted for medical research. There are some among us, however, who seem to feel that there is no great urgency to appropriate these funds asked for today. I personally feel that the urgency is great because for many of our people their day of doom is already settled, unless science comes up with the answer.

In American industry, the word "cooperation" is an essential. As you know, every successful business organization in this country depends upon the smooth performance of each individual working effectively to make up the perfect team. If we in Congress will look upon our support of this appropriation as a business arrangement with the diligent medical men in the National Institutes of Public Health, I am convinced we will arrive at the solution to many of our national health problems.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRIMBLE: On page 14, strike out all of line 1 and line 2.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, since the adoption of the Barden amendment it is all the more imperative to adopt this amendment which I have offered which strikes this language:

*Provided further, That none of this appropriation shall be available for vocational educational education in distributive occupations.*

As I said a moment ago, you have a group of high school boys and girls; one takes vocational agriculture, another takes trade and industry; a girl takes home economics, and over here is a boy who wants to take education in what is known as distributive education, the selling phase of our economy, yet he is shut



off. This would be discriminatory legislation as written. I do hope that the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that distributive businesses, such as wholesaling, retailing, and servicing organizations, employ approximately one-fourth of all of the employables in the United States today? It is the second largest segment of our economy, being surpassed only by that of manufacturing.

Mr. TRIMBLE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman's amendment will restore in the bill exactly what was cut out in the past 2 years by the committee and the House of Representatives on their recommendation. They did not give anything for the distributive education part of this program in the last 2 years; is that correct?

Mr. TRIMBLE. No; I do not think so.

Mr. GARY. I may say to the gentleman that absolutely is not correct. It is true that this House during the past 2 years reduced the funds for distributive education, and I think improperly, but they have never cut them out entirely. This would cut them out entirely.

Mr. BUSBEY. The record shows the House cut them out completely in the last 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment dealing with line 24, page 13. I trust the committee will accept the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABBITT: Page 13, line 24, after the parenthesis and comma strike out "\$15,873,870" and insert "\$18,498,261."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Just what does that amendment refer to?

Mr. ABBITT. It is line 24, page 13. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment might be corrected to show that it is line 24 after the word "exceed" and deals with the amounts to be distributed to the States.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is agreeable to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the revised amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABBITT: Page 13, line 24, after the word "exceed", strike out "\$15,873,870" and insert "\$18,498,261."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. BUSBEY: Page 14, after line 2, insert "Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section 22 of the act of June 29, 1935, as amended, \$2,501,500."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment, I should make an explanation to the committee. This is the \$2,501,500 that was disallowed by the committee for land-grant colleges. Some people have stated that we cut out all of the appropriation for land-grant colleges. This is not true.

There is a permanent appropriation for \$2,500,000, under a law which has been in effect since 1889. That is permanent legislation and this committee has no jurisdiction over that at all. In addition, there are 15 or more other appropriations which go, in whole or in part, to the land-grant colleges.

The \$2,501,500 that was in the original request by the Bureau of the Budget was for a further endowment to the colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts. That was put in by a law passed in 1935, known as the Bankhead-Jones Act.

That was an emergency measure. I have a copy of the committee hearings, and I will insert some of the testimony of the heads of educational institutions in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. They came before the House Committee on Agriculture and made a plea for this on the basis of the emergency existing at that time. The committee thought that the emergency had long since passed. This appropriation should have been discontinued years ago. We realize the condition in which some of the land-grant colleges would be, in view of the fact that, in most cases, the State legislatures have adjourned. We are, however, giving the States notice that the committee will expect the States to assume this responsibility at the earliest possible date.

I talked to some of the school people regarding this situation, and they said, "Yes, it would cramp us a little bit this year, because we were depending on the fund, as small as it is, but nevertheless we could get by if we had to." Now the committee is being generous, to say the least, by offering this amendment to restore these funds in the hope that, within a year or two, this Federal appropriation can be eliminated altogether.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I appreciate the willingness on the part of the chairman of the committee to introduce this amendment. I think it was the proper thing to do at this time because many legislatures will not be in session until after the first of the year and, of course, they have already made or are making contracts with the teachers for next season.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I just want to add to what the gentleman has said about the advisability of putting the schools on notice that the Federal Government expects to terminate support of this operation. I have had communications from presidents of some of the universities. Without exception they have said to me they would be perfectly willing to undertake to go to their State legislatures and determine there whether or not the program will be supported. Certainly what the Chairman of the subcommittee has said, and, I hope what I have said here, will be interpreted for just what it is, a notice that the time has come to get this particular function back to the States, as a matter of State responsibility.

Mr. BUSBEY. I hope the members of the committee will take a few moments to read the insertion I will make at this point, concerning the testimony of the heads of these institutions that came to Washington in 1935 to testify that this was an emergency measure.

Statements made by university and college officials before the House Committee on Agriculture on March 29, 1935, in support of H. R. 6123, to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges, and H. R. 6981, to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture.

STATEMENT OF DR. T. O. WALTON, PRESIDENT, TEXAS AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE, COLLEGE STATION, TEX.

The States are finding it continually more and more difficult, particularly in these times of depression, to meet these additional demands. Therefore, the representatives of the land-grant colleges and the representatives of the organized farmers of the State and Nation are coming to the Congress, believing that it is only proper that the Congress should provide additional funds for all three divisions, and that these funds should be adequate enough to enable us to meet the new demands that are being laid upon this system of educational institutions. \* \* \*

\* \* \* The land-grant colleges were established under an act of Congress in 1862. It was a time of national crisis. Today the Nation is again confronted with a crisis more dangerous than the crisis growing out of the issues of the Civil War. We were fighting then to preserve the Union. We are fighting now to preserve human values. We were fighting then to destroy human slavery. We are fighting now to overcome economic slavery. \* \* \*

\* \* \* Due to the extraordinary demands that are now made upon the teaching divisions of the land-grant colleges to direct research and extension and to take leadership of various agricultural adjustment projects and industrial recovery programs, the colleges can no longer meet additional demands made upon them adequately without further financial support. Heretofore they have depended upon the States to meet this obligation and the States have responded in the main to the extent of their financial ability. But the States, many of them, are now unable to provide the necessary resources for the proper conduct and efficient operation of the teaching divisions of these institutions. In the main, the States have provided adequate buildings and



equipment to meet the needs of the teaching, research, and extension divisions, but they are finding it increasingly difficult, particularly in these times of depression, to secure the funds necessary to provide the additional teachers to carry the increased teaching loads. Nor should the States be expected, under the general partnership arrangement that has prevailed since the establishment of these institutions, to carry these increased burdens without additional contributions to the teaching divisions from the National Government.

STATEMENT BY DR. F. B. MUMFORD, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, DEAN OF THE SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE AND DIRECTOR OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, COLUMBIA, MO.

It is true, however, that the depression has created an entirely new set of problems requiring the most careful investigation by the most competent investigators.

STATEMENT OF DR. F. G. FARRELL, PRESIDENT OF KANSAS STATE COLLEGE, MANHATTAN, KANS.

Shortly after the depression began there was a temporary decline in the resident-teaching load in the land-grant colleges. The enrollment of ordinary college students declined, and there were other reductions in the teaching load, not very great, but significant. At the same time the State support began to be reduced. Our State support in Kansas, for instance, in the last 2 years, according to the legislative action taken just a few days ago, is 28 percent lower than it was in 1930 and 1931. Because of that reduced State support we have had to reduce our teaching faculty about 15 percent, and comparable reductions have been made in the teaching faculties of most of the land-grant colleges. Those reductions were all right as long as the student enrollments were down, but in the last 2 years there has been a very marked increase in student enrollment. I do not know what it is for the country as a whole, but in our institution our enrollment is 17 percent greater than it was a year ago; that is, the general enrollment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK) having assumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution there.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H. R. 5246) under consideration today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### OUTPATIENT DENTAL CARE FOR WAR VETERANS

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to correct certain abuses with respect to outpatient dental care for war veterans. May I say at the outset, I am sure there is not a single member of this body who would deny to our veterans dental care they rightly deserve. For example, I know that not one of us would offer argument in the case of a veteran who receives dental care as result of a gunshot wound through the jaw. On the other hand, however, objection can be raised to that dental care received in outpatient service rendered to veterans by Veterans' Administration clinics and offices or by participating fee-basis dentists—in other words, home-town dental practitioners who participate with the VA in furnishing dental care.

My discussion this afternoon is limited solely to this latter provision of existing legislation.

Permit me to preface my remarks with a few pertinent facts on the dental-care program. My authority is the annual report of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration for fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. As of June 30, 1952, there were 402 full-time dentists on duty in regional-office clinics. In addition, approximately 762 consultants assisted the VA dental staff. Further, some 62,000 dentists indicated their availability to participate in the fee-basis dental program.

In 1951 there were 588,378 applications for dental care. Out of this number, 367,868 were authorized for dental treatment. In 1952 there were 616,550 applicants, and 406,588 were authorized. Over and above this, 180,178 cases were still pending for determination in 1952. According to the Booze-Allen report, about 40 percent of all the outpatient treatment in the Veterans' Administration in 1951 consisted of dental care. The estimated cost of this care ran in excess of \$30 million. The average annual cost has been approximately \$35 million since the end of World War II. Under the present law, a veteran is entitled to dental care for life for any tooth that became defective in the service or was aggravated in service or within 1 year of discharge. The bill which I have submitted for consideration by this Congress is restricted solely to outpatient dental care. It provides that no outpatient dental services or appliances for dental disability not compensable in degree shall be furnished after the end of 2 years from the date of discharge or 6 months from the date this amendment is enacted, whichever is later.

Our veterans as taxpayers are interested in sound economy. This fact reassures me that they, too, will render their wholehearted support to this legislation. They realize, as do all our citizens, that this whole economy problem is a serious one, which can be solved only through the cooperation of every

single American citizen, regardless of his status in life.

As President Eisenhower said in his message Tuesday night—

Government cannot do this job, any more than any other job, utterly alone. You and your fellow citizens who want your Government to spend less must yourselves practice self-restraint in the demands you make upon your Government. You as citizens cannot help the common cause by merely favoring economy for every group except the one to which you belong.

I hope and trust that these words will be recalled when this bill is to be considered.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show that because I was at the funeral of our former colleague, Mr. Hull, on Wednesday, I missed two votes on the agricultural appropriation bill. Had I been present, I would have voted to restore the funds.

#### CANCER RESEARCH

(Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. FOGARTY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on the first day I sat as a Member of the House of Representatives, which was the 3d day of January last, I was called upon to speak in commemoration of our late friend and colleague, the former senior Senator from the State of Connecticut, Brien McMahon. I said on that day that Brien McMahon was stricken down in the prime of his life, only in his 49th year and in the early days of his second term in the Senate of the United States. I remarked, "It is a great pity and a great tragedy that the Congress has lost him, and it is a greater pity and a greater tragedy that his State and his Nation have lost him because he had so much to give in the difficult years ahead."

As you all know, the death of Brien McMahon was due to cancer. Two other Members of the Senate were victims of cancer in the last few years, as were several of our colleagues in the House of Representatives. As a matter of fact, there is hardly a Member of either House who in the realm of his own friendship or in his own immediate family has not felt the swift and silent hand of cancer strike with unrelenting force. That is why today, when we consider this bill which provides funds for research in cancer and also for research in the other major fields of disease which kill and incapacitate our people, we cannot think alone in terms of dollars. We must think as well in terms of human lives and of the great loss we suffer of the hearts and minds of those we cannot ever replace.

The funds which are provided in this bill are broadly speaking on a par with the funds provided in the budget enacted a year ago and in the climate in which some of our Members think and act today in the Federal Legislature, it may be that it will be difficult to provide more



than this amount. I am fully aware that the subcommittee which conducted these hearings gave full attention and credence to the testimony of the brilliant medical men and fine-spirited citizens who presented the needs to the committee. Reading the record of those hearings, I was struck again and again with the simple eloquence of the somber story they told. And at the conclusion of that record I was convinced that we have done very little; that more remains to be done than has been done.

I cannot help but wonder if this great country of ours, with its vast resources and its tremendous capacity for wealth could not bring itself to provide more funds for research. It is only by research that we found the answer to the diseases which today have disappeared and which are now academic matters in the medical books of the universities. It is only by research that we will find the answer to the problems of cancer, heart disease, neurological disorders, and all the other dread diseases that rob us of our substance.

I am glad that the bill under consideration calls for a tiny increase in the funds for research. I had hoped we could meet the problem more fully. I trust we will be able to do so next year, and I know that only if we approach the problem boldly will we be meeting our full responsibility to the citizens, not of a single congressional district or of a single State, but to the citizens of the whole United States. For the problem is a national problem, the responsibility is a national responsibility, and we are the ones, in the final analysis, who must see that the job is done.

#### FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, as far as the depositors of two Chicago banks are concerned, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has failed them and has refused to live up to its obligations. For 5 weeks now the Devon Northtown State Bank and the First State Bank of Elmwood Park have been closed. People with funds in the banks have been unable to draw any part of them. Businessmen are desperately in need of their money for working capital, and people who need money for ordinary household needs, for rent, and for food are unable to use their money. They are being squeezed by inaction of the State auditor and the claimed inability of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to pay.

The people of Chicago and the people of America have believed that when a bank was closed for any reason the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation would protect them. If the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is to maintain the confidence of the people of America, it had better act quickly to relieve the people of the city of Chicago.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SHELLEY asked and was given permission to address the House on

Tuesday next for 1 hour, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. SIEMINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to announce that I will not go on the trip to witness the atomic explosion so that I may be here on Monday to vote on the pending bill which I think is very important.

#### VALUE OF PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an article and a letter from the Army Times which was sent to me by Mr. Les Honeycutt describing the very remarkable prosthetic appliance demonstration by a quadruple amputee the other day. I also have in my hand a letter from the man that Mr. Honeycutt speaks of. While the letter is addressed to me personally, I am sure this young man had in mind every one who has helped to develop and further the use of prosthetic appliances for these very brave men.

Mr. Speaker, this young man is one of the finest and bravest young men it has ever been my privilege to know. He is a quadruple amputee.

Mr. Speaker, the article and letter to which I refer are as follows:

Dear Mrs. ROGERS: Enclosed you will find a tearsheet of the May 23 issue of the veterans edition of Army Times, on which appears an article I think you will enjoy.

Sincerely,

LES HONEYCUTT.

[From the Army Times of May 23, 1953]  
SOUTH AFRICAN WAR VET TAKES LONG, LONG TRIP

WASHINGTON.—The few steps a young South African Air Force veteran of World War II made here this week represented the longest trip of his life—even though he had previously flown thousands of miles from his native country to be fitted for artificial limbs in the United States.

Eric Schultz, a quadrilateral amputee, walked 50 paces before the attentive eyes of House Veterans' Affairs Committee members at the conclusion of an hour-long demonstration of prosthetic appliances arranged by the advisory committee on artificial limbs of the National Academy of Sciences.

Beads of sweat clung tightly to Schultz's upper lip as he demonstrated his artificial arms and legs before committee members and 125 defense and medical observers from many nations.

He started slowly and hesitantly but had the thing whipped when he stepped up and across a platform in the middle of a caucus room in the House Office Building.

For Schultz, the demonstration marked the end of a long and successful struggle to get adequate artificial limbs since he left the South African Air Force in 1946.

Luck—not the kind that nearly killed him, made the difference between a cripple and an alert, ambitious veteran eager to get on with his fledgling career as a surface elec-

trician at the Transvaal Chamber of Mines in South Africa.

Schultz wrote a half-dozen letters to artificial limb manufacturers in the United States 6 years ago. One of the letters arrived at the office of a termite control company in Los Angeles, the former site of an artificial limb maker long since out of business.

A secretary opened Schultz's letter by mistake and immediately became interested in his problem. She knew of the prosthetics program being carried on at the University of California at Los Angeles. She wrote Schultz details of the program and the wheels started churning.

The Rotary Club in Johannesburg, South Africa, raised funds for Schultz's trip to the United States. He arrived in Los Angeles and finally was fitted with upper extremity prosthesis at the University of California and then went to the Oakland Naval Hospital in California for his lower limbs.

Now he walks confidently and, according to an aide of Gen. F. S. Strong, executive director of the National Research Council, who now rooms with Schultz in a Washington hotel, Schultz can handle himself well.

Schultz had an attentive audience in the House caucus room this week—but none so attentive as five disabled Korea veterans brought in from the Army's Walter Reed Hospital here to witness 10 amputees demonstrate different types of prosthetic equipment.

Two of the Korea veterans were in wheelchairs, another was, himself, a quadruple amputee like Schultz. He walked in without crutches, already having acclimated himself to his new artificial legs.

One of the wheelchair patients was just back from a Chinese Communist prisoner-of-war camp. He looked small and young—but very determined. He blushed slightly when the audience applauded after House Veterans' Committee chairman, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican, Massachusetts, introduced him.

A fourth Korean vet sat in the second row of the large caucus room. He leaned forward during the entire demonstration, adjusted his glasses frequently and occasionally glanced down at the bandaged-covered stump that used to be his hand.

All of them will be fitted with artificial limbs—limbs that are constantly being approved by the committee to advance rehabilitation techniques for disabled veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS said she had heard the House Appropriations Committee would continue the \$1 million yearly appropriation to conduct the committee's work.

She reminded the audience that the efforts of the committee—composed of Defense Department, Veterans' Administration and other interested medical and lay authorities on the subject—help not only disabled veterans, but disabled civilians as well.

General Strong echoed her statement, and declared it an inspiring thing that Schultz could come from a friendly, free nation to get help.

New types of arms and legs were demonstrated by ex-GIs. To them and to thousands of others, they represent the difference between existing and living.

DEAR Mrs. ROGERS: Just a few lines to try to express my gratitude for what you have done for the amputee.

I would like to thank you for being the person responsible for my visit to the United States to be fitted out with prosthesis for upper and lower extremities through the National Research Council, because if it had not been through your efforts, I would not be wearing these most wonderful appliances and would still be a cripple in south Africa today. As it is, I have learned to be quite self-reliant and independent and need ask nobody for any personal assistance.

I can imagine all the hours of labor your work entails, of the frustration and stum-









# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued May 26, 1953

For actions of May 25, 1953

83rd-1st, No. 95

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

## CONTENTS

Alaska statehood.....20	Interest rates.....4	Patents.....27
Appropriations....8,9,10,21	Lands, grazing.....16	Personnel.....2,7,13
Cotton.....24	public.....25	Reclamation.....17
Credit unions.....15	transfer.....6	Reorganization.....1,26
Education.....9,21	Leave.....2	Research.....6
Electrification.....14,17	Livestock industry.....18	Retirement.....13
Expenditures.....22	Missouri Basin.....12	Trade, foreign.....23
Export insurance.....24	New England.....5	Treaties.....28
Flood control.....3,8,12		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported USDA reorganization plan. House debated Labor-HEW appropriation bill. House sent 3rd supplemental appropriation bill to conference. House committee reported Army civil appropriation bill. Sen. Malone recommended private ownership for Federal range lands.

## SENATE

1. REORGANIZATION. The Government Operations Committee reported adversely S. Res. 100, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, relating to this Department (S. Rept. 297)(p. 5596). It was agreed that this measure will be debated May 27 (pp. 5626-7).
2. PERSONNEL. H. R. 4654 was made the unfinished business (p. 5627). As amended by the Senate committee, this bill provides as follows: Removes from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 Presidential appointees at more than \$14,800, and authorizes the President to exempt additional officials. Suspends the entitlement of such persons to lump-sum payments during their exemption. Repeals the Thomas amendment, thereby reinstating the accumulation provisions of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951. Allows accumulation limits to take effect at the beginning of the first pay period of the calendar year, thus permitting the use of unused accrued leave over the Christmas and New Year's holidays, while maintaining the advantages of pay-period accounting.
3. FLOOD CONTROL. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment H. R. 4025, authorizing \$75,000,000 for additional Army flood control on the Columbia River Basin (S. Rept. 303)(p. 5596).
4. INTEREST RATES. Sen. Murray criticized the Treasury policy of permitting increases in interest rates on Government securities (pp. 5636-7).
5. NEW ENGLAND. Sen. Kennedy spoke on the economic problems of New England (pp. 5637-48).
6. RESEARCH. Received a Nebr. Legislature memorial requesting transfer of the Ft. Robinson agricultural station to Nebr. (p. 5592).



HOUSE

7. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment H. R. 5275, to extend from Dec. 31, 1953, until June 30, 1954, the time within which the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel must submit its report (H. Rept. 452) (p. 5710).
8. FLOOD-CONTROL APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 5376, the Army civil functions appropriation bill for 1954 (H. Rept. 450) on May 23, during adjournment (p. 5710). The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of this bill (p. 5710).
9. LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. Concluded reading for amendment this bill, H. R. 5246, but deferred the vote on passage until today, May 26 (pp. 5657-705). Agreed to a Fogarty amendment to increase by \$6,000,000 the funds for payments to federally-impacted areas for education (pp. 5657-9).
10. THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Reps. Taber, Clevenger, Busbey, Cannon, and Whitten were appointed conferees on this bill, H. R. 4664 (pp. 5656-7). Senate conferees were appointed May 6.
11. REORGANIZATION. A Government Operations subcommittee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 4206, to establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources, and H. R. 992, to establish a Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch (May 22) (p. D467). Rep. Brown, Ohio, urged quick passage of these bills (p. 5656).

BILLS INTRODUCED

12. MISSOURI BASIN. S. 1964, by Sen. Martin, to modify the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944; to Public Works Committee (p. 5596).
13. PERSONNEL. S. 1965, by Sen. Mundt, to prevent the payment of Civil Service or Foreign Service retirement annuities to persons convicted of certain disloyalty crimes; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 5596). Remarks of author (pp. 5596-7).
14. ELECTRIFICATION. S. 1971, by Sen. Aiken (for Sen. Ives), to provide for electric power development of the Niagara River; to Public Works Committee (p. 5596). Remarks of author (p. 5600).
15. CREDIT UNIONS. S. 1973, by Sen. Butler, Md., providing for insurance of membership share balances in Federal credit unions by FDIC; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 5596).
16. GRAZING LANDS. S. 1982, by Sen. Malone, to establish a special grazing district in Nev., etc.; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 5596). Remarks of author, including recommendation for private ownership of Federal grazing lands (pp. 5627-30).
17. RECLAMATION. H. R. 5377, by Rep. Dondero, to rescind the authorization for the Libby Dam project; to Public Works Committee (p. 5710).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

18. LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY. Sen. Thye inserted his speech before the Natural Livestock



other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, CLEVINGER, BUSBEY, CANNON, and WHITTEN.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5246, with Mr. NICHOLSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will continue the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of public and school library service; coordination of library service on the national level with other forms of adult education; developing library participation in Federal projects; fostering nationwide coordination of research materials among libraries, interstate library coordination and the development of library service throughout the country; purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education, and repairing the same; \$2,500,000: *Provided*, That all receipts from non-Federal agencies representing reimbursement for expenses of travel of employees of the Office of Education performing advisory functions to the said agencies shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of this appropriation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of members of the Committee, I should like them to know that after I have made this little talk, I will offer an amendment to increase the payments to school districts in federally impacted areas and an amendment to increase the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation, and then I shall offer an amendment to increase the hospital construction program from \$50 million to \$75 million, and then an amendment covering the hospital and medical care program.

Mr. Chairman, I had expected to offer an amendment at this point in regard

to the construction of school facilities under Public Law 815. But I have been advised by the clerk of the committee that it would not be germane to this particular bill because this bill makes appropriations starting July 1, 1953. It was to be for \$95 million for the construction of school facilities in these federally impacted areas. I just want to let the committee and the Congress know that when the next supplemental bill comes before the House, I will offer that amendment for the construction of school facilities in federally impacted areas of \$95 million. That means that all of these schools that have met the criteria and whose applications have been accepted would be entitled to that \$95 million.

In passing Public Law 815, Congress declared it to be the policy of the United States that in recognition of the impact that certain Federal activities have had on the school construction needs in the areas in which Federal activities have been or are being carried on the United States would bear the cost of constructing school facilities in such areas in the manner and to the extent provided under the terms of the act. The law provided a specific formula for determining the eligibility of school districts for assistance and the amount of Federal assistance each district was entitled to receive.

This law authorized 2 years, to June 30, 1952, in which school districts could make applications; 3 years, to June 30, 1953, in which appropriations could be made to pay the established entitlements; and 1 remaining year to complete the program. The law further provided that if a school district had spent its own funds and built school facilities for the Federally connected children in its district, it could receive a reimbursement payment not to exceed either the cost of constructing the school facilities or the amount of the entitlement. However, under the law all requests for construction had to be met before any reimbursement request could be paid.

In testifying before the House subcommittee on the status of the school construction program authorized by this act, officials of the Office of Education reported that 1,128 school districts submitted applications for assistance under section 202 of the act by June 30, 1952, the last date on which applications could be accepted. Of that number 940 school districts were eligible for assistance and 188 were found to be ineligible. These 940 eligible school districts submitted approximately 1,600 requests for construction amounting to \$362 million and 184 requests for reimbursement amounting to a little over \$25 million. Requirements for school facilities on Federal property under section 204 of the act were reported to be \$43,380,000 and for temporary facilities under section 203 were \$5 million, making a grand total required of \$435,828,608. These data are shown in a table on page 166 of the hearings before the subcommittee for appropriations for 1954 for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency.

This table also shows that the Congress has appropriated \$341,500,000 to meet the total requirements of approximately

\$435 million. The amount appropriated is now approximately \$95,500,000 short of meeting the total requirements. The remaining entitlements that cannot be paid because of insufficient appropriations are made up of \$70,800,000 in construction applications and approximately \$25 million in reimbursement applications.

Because the funds appropriated were insufficient to meet all of the entitlements, Office of Education officials testified that it was necessary to allot funds on the basis of the greatest relative urgency of need as required by the act. In setting up the priority formula and distributing this money the office provided funds for only minimum school facilities for 90 percent of the unhoused children in any district. In other words they required that each school district absorb 10 percent of its enrollment in order to spread these funds as far as possible to provide minimum school facilities for unhoused children.

The testimony on page 175 of the hearings shows that in my own State of Rhode Island there were 4 school districts eligible for assistance under this act and these 4 districts were entitled to and had requested \$831,000 for construction of school facilities and \$77,933 for reimbursement. Only 1 school district in the entire State—the Middleton School district—has received an allotment of funds under this law, and it received \$322,107. This leaves an amount of \$509,014 in construction and \$77,933 in reimbursement, or a total of \$586,947, which the law says the federally impacted school districts in Rhode Island are entitled to receive, yet a total of only \$322,000, or about 35 percent of the entitlement, can be paid to these districts with the funds that have been appropriated.

Office of Education officials testified during the hearings before the subcommittee that, as a result of questionnaire returns submitted by federally affected school districts, there would be a very substantial impact of additional federally connected children migrating into these defense areas between June 30, 1952, the last date on which applications could be submitted, and June 30, 1954. This is in addition to the fact that a substantial number of school districts that were eligible for assistance under Public Law 815 have received no funds to date and that those school districts that did receive allotments were restricted to amounts sufficient to house only 90 percent of their unhoused children. Mr. Leonard O. Maine, superintendent of schools in Portsmouth, R. I., in a letter to me dated March 15, 1953, stated that his school district was entitled to \$77,932 under Public Law 815. On the strength of this entitlement and in anticipation of its payment, the town borrowed money and built a school to accommodate defense-connected children and requested reimbursement of this amount. That reimbursement has not been paid for the reasons previously stated. Mr. Maine says that a trailer housing project for 300 families is now being constructed on Navy property in Melville and that this



project probably will yield more than 300 additional school children. He further states that the present school facilities are crowded and that the addition of these children will make the situation in Portsmouth critical.

Office of Education officials testified that these federally impacted communities had provided from their own sources \$550 million during the period beginning with World War II to build needed school facilities in their districts. These districts also provided an additional \$80 million to put into projects for which they received an allotment of funds under Public Law 815. In other words in addition to a half billion dollars spent during the period of World War II, these districts paid approximately 25 percent of the total cost of projects approved under Public Law 815. Thus it appears that many of these school districts have pretty well exhausted their resources to provide additional school facilities. These data are found on page 180 of the hearings.

In view of the fact that Public Law 815 stated it to be the policy of the United States to compensate these school districts for the burden imposed on them by Federal activities and that part but not all of the school districts have received that compensation, I believe that this Congress has a moral obligation to appropriate the \$95,500,000 necessary to meet the eligible requests for construction and for reimbursement that have been submitted to the Office of Education in accordance with the terms of the act. I do not see how we can pass a law that says all districts that meet certain requirements are eligible for Federal assistance and then by not appropriating sufficient funds say that only certain school districts can receive that money. This is particularly bad policy in my opinion when it generally is the school districts that have done most with their resources that now cannot receive the funds which the law says they are entitled to receive.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 15, line 1, strike out "\$60,500,000" and insert "\$66,500,000."

Mr. GWINN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. GWINN. The reading clerk went so rapidly on page 14 that he did not even mention a little item of \$2,500,000. I want to make a point of order in regard to that language, and if the chairman please I would like the language to be read. I want to make a point of order against the language.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, may I state the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be heard on the point of order.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language on page 14 from lines 3 to 22 inclusive contains legislation on an appropriation bill. It is obvious from the language itself

that it provides for expenditures for activities and programs which are not authorized by basic law, and is, therefore, in violation of clause 2 of rule 21.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must rule that the gentleman from Rhode Island had debated this paragraph, and the point of order comes too late.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet at the time. I asked unanimous consent that my point be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York should have raised the point of order then.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield. The gentleman from New York was on his feet and the Chairman properly, I think, recognized the gentleman from Rhode Island, a member of the committee. But the gentleman from New York was on his feet simultaneously, and I saw him on his feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, according to custom, always recognizes a member of the committee before someone else. Therefore, the Chair recognized the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. Then the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] could have raised the point of order.

Mr. TABER. But he raised the point of order before the amendment was read.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the paragraph on salaries and expenses starting in line 3 on page 14.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from New York is not a novice on this floor. The gentleman from New York has served here many years with distinction. He knows the procedure of the House. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] made his statement and then offered an amendment which the Clerk reported. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN], at the moment when the gentleman from Rhode Island offered his amendment, had then risen, before the amendment was reported, there might have been some reason for granting this unanimous-consent request. But in view of the fact that he was here, paying attention, listening to the amendment being read, and then undertakes to go back, I feel constrained to object, and I do object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] asks unanimous consent to return to salaries and expenses.

Is there objection?

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment, which is at the desk.

Mr. HALE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Maine seek recognition?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has been recog-

nized and offered his amendment, and is entitled to recognition in support of the amendment which has been reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Payments to school districts: For payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), \$60,500,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of such act.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 15, line 1, strike out "\$60,500,000" and insert "\$66,500,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I had no desire to restrain the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] from offering an amendment, but I think the RECORD will show that the Clerk had read through lines 3 to 22, and it was not until after he had read the next paragraph, "Payments to school districts," that I asked for recognition and received it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I just want to say that hereafter on this bill every word must be read.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think that is a good idea, because it seems very strange to me that a quorum call just concluded shows that only 250 Members are present in Washington. Over 160 Members are not present in this House when we are considering an appropriation bill that calls for the expenditure of \$2 billion. I hope that every word of the bill will be read, as suggested by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. TABER], because I think it is that important.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. In view of the statement just made by the gentleman, I think the gentleman should also include in his statement that under a previous arrangement over 100 Members are out in Yucca Flat, at the experimental explosion of the atomic bomb.

Mr. FOGARTY. Which is, I would say, on official business.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman does not think that the consideration of this bill is official business?

Mr. FOGARTY. I certainly do, and I think the gentleman from New York will consider that I was one who wanted to finish this bill on Friday. If we had continued on until around 7:30 we could have had it finished with most of the Members here.

Mr. TABER. It was evident that we could not.

Mr. FOGARTY. Not in my opinion.



Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I regret very much this colloquy here about these absent Members. Sure, it is official business, and it is important that this enormous appropriation bill be considered; but it is also important for Members of Congress to know something about what the other untold billions of money that are appropriated for atomic energy is all about also; and I just think it is maybe a little bit—well, unfortunate—that this colloquy should go on and place these absent Members who are out there witnessing this revolutionary explosion—chastise them in this manner. Sure, they are both important; it is just unfortunate that the Members cannot be in both places at the same time.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not think any of my remarks will show that I was trying to chastise anyone. I did not start this colloquy in the first place; it was started on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. There is no reason whatsoever why this bill could not be put over until tomorrow. We have plenty of time this week. Instead of adjourning Thursday, let us sit Thursday and Friday; let the Committee rise; let the bill go over until tomorrow when the Members can be here and present their views.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported that we may have it in our minds as we start its consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 15, line 1, strike out "\$60,500,000" and insert "\$66,500,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this problem has been with Congress since 1950. Only a few weeks ago the Bureau of Education requested, for all these school districts in the federally impacted areas of the country, a sum of about \$24 million. By a large vote the amendment to the supplemental bill which is similar to the one I am offering here was adopted; there were only 18 or 20 votes in the entire House at that time against it: \$20,500,000. They gave this figure to meet 100 percent of the amount the schools in the federally impacted areas were entitled to.

Today we are faced with the same problem. They originally made a request for \$70 million for 1954 to meet the entitlements of the school districts in these federally impacted areas. After

a revision of the budget, the Eisenhower budget allowed \$66,500,000 on the basis that there would be less defense spending in 1954 and that they did not think at that time they would need the \$70 million. But after a thorough revision of the estimates, the Eisenhower budget came up with a total of \$66,500,000. The committee has cut that budget to \$60,500,000, or a \$9,500,000 cut from the original budget and a \$6 million cut from Eisenhower budget. This law was passed in 1950. I do not think there were over 50 votes against it. It was in September when we were meeting in the old Ways and Means room across the street. It required at that time an appropriation of \$25 million to start with. We have never had a record vote on it. You never could get more than 15 or 25 Members on this floor to oppose the amendment because we guaranteed to these school districts that they would receive this money if they met the requirements or the criteria that was spelled out in meeting these entitlements.

We not only have a moral responsibility to them now but it is a responsibility written by you men and women in 1950 that guaranteed this appropriation. One might ask, Why not let the Federal Government take care of their own? If we said to the various towns and cities: "We are not going to give you this money," then it would be the responsibility of the armed services to provide appropriations to educate these children located on the posts throughout the country as well as in various defense establishments and it would cost the Federal Government today \$278.71 for each child. Under this arrangement where the local community and the State pay a certain sum it costs \$144.50 to educate that particular child.

If we are not going to give them the money that they are entitled to, if we are not going to live up to our moral responsibility as Members of Congress, why do we not repeal the law rather than try to cut them now and say to these local communities, "No, the Federal Government is not going to live up to its responsibility; you provide as best you can the facilities to educate these children whose parents are working in defense establishments or whose parents are living on an Army post or in a defense establishment."

If you do that, then the communities are going to say to the Federal Government, "O. K. We entered into an agreement with the Federal Government in 1950 to provide a certain share of the funds that it would cost to operate and maintain these schools. If the Federal Government does not want to live up to its responsibility, then let the Federal Government assume all of the responsibility of educating these children."

If you do that it is going to cost you just double what it is costing you today to educate a child in that particular category. There is no other answer to it. The answer is there, it is in the record, and it cannot be disputed.

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS, PUBLIC LAW 874, 1954

In passing Public Law 874 Congress declared it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance for

those local educational agencies on which the United States had placed financial burdens by reason of the fact that revenues available from local sources had been reduced as a result of acquisition of real property by the United States, or such local educational agency had provided education for children residing on Federal property, or whose parents were employed on Federal property, or there had been a sudden and substantial increase in enrollment as a result of Federal activity.

This law was passed after a detailed investigation in the field by subcommittees of the House Committee on Education and Labor of the problems created for local educational agencies by activities of the Federal Government and thorough and careful study of these problems by both the House and Senate in developing the concepts that were written into the law. It coordinated the various types of Federal assistance programs for school purposes that had previously been authorized through a number of different Federal agencies in an overall program which has been administered on a uniform basis to all school districts. This is the third year the program has been in existence and it has worked well. Experience with the legislation indicates that certain minor adjustments need to be made in the basic provisions, but on the whole the legislation is sound and has proved satisfactory in meeting those serious financial burdens which Federal projects created for some local school districts.

The cost has increased each year since 1951 because expenditures for defense activities and other Federal projects have increased very substantially the number of families living on Federal property and the number of school children whose parents are employed on Federal property. In fact, expenditures for defense purposes which directly affect the requirements under this program have increased by a substantially greater percentage than the cost of this program. Because of the nature of the provisions in the act which require that the final entitlement of school districts must be determined on actual attendance of federally connected children after the end of the school year, it is very difficult for the administering agency to estimate accurately the total cost of this program for any given year until near the end of that year.

On the basis of the most recent data available at the time as to 1953 costs the Office of Education originally estimated that \$72,818,000 would be required for the 1954 fiscal year. The original request to the Congress was set at \$70 million. The amendment added to the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act—Public Law 11—for 1953 by the Congress would raise the estimated cost by approximately \$300,000. The administration voluntarily reduced the original appropriation request for 1954 from \$70 million to \$66,500,000 primarily on the basis that reduced defense spending would decrease employment on Federal property under Public Law 874. This administration request is based on the assumption that entitlements of the



school districts would be paid at 100 percent.

In spite of this situation, the committee has recommended that \$60 million be appropriated for this program rather than the revised estimate of \$66,500,000 in the Eisenhower budget, or the \$70 million in the Truman budget. If this item is reduced to \$60 million as recommended by the committee, which is one-half million less than the amount appropriated in 1953, a supplemental request in 1954 would be required next January or the Office of Education would be forced to prorate amounts appropriated among all eligible school districts. This proration would be at about 85 percent of the amount due each district if the entitlements reach the level of \$70 million, as was originally estimated, and it would be about 90 percent if entitlements do not exceed the revised administration request of \$36.5 million.

Operation of a school system requires careful planning and detailed budgeting of income and expenditures. In most communities in the Nation the tax rate for school purposes or the local revenue allocated for operation of schools must under State law be set in April, May, or June preceding the opening of schools in September. This is necessary in order that teachers may be hired, contracts for equipment and supplies completed and other necessary commitments made before the fall term begins.

Since school districts must plan their school programs and set their budgets in this manner it is essential for them to know how much of their entitlements under Public Law 874 the Federal Government plans to pay. Otherwise they are at a loss to know what to budget from this source. Since Congress has stated it to be the policy of the Federal Government to pay an amount equal to the Federal burden posed by Federal activities and since the Congress has on three successive occasions through the passage of supplemental amounts affirmed its intention to pay the full amount of these entitlements, school districts have some basis of expecting that their full entitlements under the act will be paid. If their budgets for the year are set on this basis, and the Congress later appropriates less than this amount these districts have no way of obtaining the additional funds. The tax rate has been set for the year and in most cases cannot be changed until next year. This leaves the local school districts in a most difficult position. One source of income has been reduced and in effect the Federal Government has said we will not pay all the laws says you are entitled to receive. These school districts which have large enrollments of children of defense workers and who have had substantial amounts of their taxable land taken off the tax rolls by Federal acquisition cannot finance adequate school programs without these Federal payments. If these districts are advised that appropriated funds will pay only 85 percent or 90 percent of the amount of their entitlements, they have no alternative but to reduce their school program to fit the amount they will receive from

the Federal Government. The education of the children of defense workers and military personnel will have to suffer.

Another serious consequence of this action to reduce payments comes about through the encouragement this action gives to local school districts to refuse to accept responsibility for the education of children living on non-taxable Federal property. If a school district is on or borders a large Federal installation and agrees to educate children of parents living and working on that installation, it can do so only if it is assured that the Federal Government will meet its obligation under the law to pay that part of the local costs occasioned by the loss of real property tax revenues. If the Federal Government fails to accept this obligation fully, then some local school districts may turn the whole problem of educating these children over to Uncle Sam and force the Federal Government to establish schools under section 6 of Public Law 874. When the State refuses to accept responsibility for the education of children living on Federal property no State aid or local funds is paid for the cost of these educational services, and accordingly, the Federal Government is required to pay 100 percent of the cost. The data submitted to the subcommittee by the Office of Education shows that the average rate paid for children living on Federal property under section 3 (a) of the act was estimated to be \$144.50 for the fiscal year 1954. On page 246 of the hearings the Office of Education stated that the actual cost per pupil for providing free public education for children living on Federal property under section 6 of the act where Federal Government paid the full cost was \$278.71. Thus, if it becomes necessary to provide for these children living on Federal property under section 6 the cost to the Federal Government would be almost twice as great as it would where responsibility for their education is accepted by the State and local educational agencies.

Let me emphasize that this appropriation item is not one that can be controlled by administrative discretion. The entitlements which are based on specific formulas written into the law will amount to a certain figure regardless of how much the Congress appropriates for this program. If the Congress appropriates more than is needed to pay 100 percent entitlements, the balance cannot be spent but reverts automatically to the Treasury. If the Congress appropriates too little to pay entitlements at 100 percent, the costly process of a supplemental request must be followed or the school districts forced to either trim their services or run the risk of a deficit.

In response to a question posed by the subcommittee chairman, it was pointed out at the committee hearings on this bill that the original 1954 estimate was designed to avoid the supplemental requests that had been necessary in each of the previous 3 years. The action now proposed by the committee will defeat this purpose unless revised by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

The Chairman, first of all, the committee should understand that the amount in the bill is exactly the same sum, \$60,500,000, as was appropriated in the last fiscal year, 1953. There is no information we could obtain which would indicate that one dollar more for 1954 will be needed than was appropriated in 1953. I would not be surprised if they have a surplus left over, should we appropriate this much money.

Mr. Chairman, we have just received a notice from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in which under the heading of "To Review Need of Ohio A-Plant," appears the following:

It has been reported that the Pentagon has called on the National Security Council to consider abandoning or at least sharply cutting down the size of the projected billion-dollar atomic plant near Portsmouth, Ohio. The idea of taking a new look at the need for the plant is reported to have come from Secretary of Defense Charles A. Wilson, and been laid before the NSC by Deputy Secretary Kyes, during Mr. Wilson's absence in Europe.

A decision, expected in a couple of weeks, awaits a reappraisal by the Defense Department of America's stockpile needs of atomic bombs. The present numerical goal was set by the old Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the new Defense team wants to reexamine the reasoning which led to the setting of the stockpile objective.

Now, if these things come to pass, and our defense production levels off, they will not need any more money than in 1953. Furthermore, as of the first of this month, they had obligated only \$24,107,224 of the \$60,500,000 appropriated for 1953, which left them, as of May 1, an unobligated balance of \$36,392,776.

Granting that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is correct as to meeting the Government's obligations to these school districts, I still say, in all seriousness and honesty, that I think the amount of \$60,500,000, as recommended by the committee, will be sufficient. It will not surprise me if they have a surplus left over at the end of the fiscal year 1954. If they do not, they will come to Congress with a supplemental appropriation request which the House will probably grant, as it has in the past. I think the amount is ample and the Committee of the Whole should reject the additional \$6 million requested in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Furthermore, I think the whole program should be examined very carefully, and revalued at this time in light of the experience of the past few years. The other day on the floor of this House, we heard a lot about discrimination. This is one of the most discriminatory programs ever instituted by the Congress. With one or two exceptions large cities cannot qualify for even 10 cents of these millions of dollars of appropriations. Now, if that is not discrimination, I do not know the meaning of the word. I hope the gentleman's amendment is defeated.



Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. I happen to be the author of the legislation under discussion, Public Laws 874 and 815.

Mr. Chairman, there is considerable disagreement and considerable difference of opinion here as to the needs of this program for the fiscal year 1954. The gentleman from Rhode Island has explained what the request was from the Department, what the Truman budget was, what the Eisenhower budget was, and what the committee did, so I will not go into that angle of it. I would like to go into the angle in a reply to the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

On the matter of discrimination and on the matter of their not needing this program, and if they did need it, that the Committee on Appropriations would be willing to give them a supplemental budget item. I cannot help but remember what happened to our supplemental bill back in January of this year when the gentleman from Illinois, without any rhyme or reason, cut the bill \$24 million. He cut it out completely. If that is going to be his attitude toward a supplemental item for 1954, we better put the item in now, rather than trust the gentleman.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I know the gentleman does not want to misstate me in what I said before. I did not speak for the committee, as to what the committee would do. I was speaking for the Congress, and I think if my statement was reread the gentleman would find that the Congress would put the supplemental item back in there. Now I know what the Congress has done before over the objection of the committee, but I did not appoint the committee.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman was not speaking for himself, I assume.

Mr. BUSBEY. I was not.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I have been of the opinion that we have been attempting to get away from deficiency and supplemental bills coming before us. I have heard the statement made many, many times that they are always coming back and asking for more money. The reason is that we have not given them what we have said we would give them under the law. If this \$60 million stands, it means less than they had this year, not more or as much, but less, and it means they will only be able to pay about 90 percent of the entitlement. These are the facts that have been given to me by those who are running the program at the present time.

Mr. BAILEY. May I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for his comments. They are correct. May I say that in the year or 2 years the committee spent in drafting this legislation, and I

happened to be chairman of the subcommittee engaged in that activity, we thought it was the most solid and most reasonable and most satisfactory legislation that has been put on the statute books in a number of years. It was solely for the purpose of discharging the Government responsibility for having impacted those school districts. We are not considering it from the standpoint of Federal aid for education. It is not a hand-out. It is not a gift. It does not approach the usual cry of creeping socialism. It is a matter of the Government's discharging its obligations to these school districts.

I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island. While I am on the floor, I should like to enlarge on his remarks in regard to Public Law 815, that is, the construction part of the amendment. I am sure the members of the committee present here today are interested in this appropriation because it affects 42 of the 48 States. It affects the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

Let me say now on that building program that I was glad to hear the gentleman from Rhode Island say that he would be a party to trying to handle the matter in the deficiency appropriation.

At the present time 940 districts have been granted entitlements; 300 of those 940 have received all of their allotments; 400 have received only a part of them; 240 of the 940 have not received any Federal grants at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BAILEY was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement. Is action being taken to reenact Public Law 815?

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad the gentleman from Oklahoma brought that matter up. I was hopeful that the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] would be on the floor today. On account of the lengthy hearings on revision of the Taft-Hartley law we have not got around to rewriting Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, as requested by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message, but the committee has that high on its agenda and I am sure it will be done before the close of the present fiscal year.

It will be necessary to redraft Public Law 874, and we will have to have some form of a construction bill similar to Public Law 815 unless, as the gentleman from Illinois suggested, some or all of these projects are eliminated in the present budget.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Would it be possible to extend Public Law 815 by resolution if

the committee does not get around to making a complete study of the program?

Mr. BAILEY. I would say that would be one approach, but I would much prefer that the gentleman from Georgia direct that question as a parliamentary inquiry. I am sure it could be done, unless the bill is rewritten and passed before the 30th of June.

Let us be practical. The gentleman from Illinois has already agreed that the Congress will write these funds back into either a regular appropriation bill or a supplemental appropriation bill. I just made the remarks I made because I know of the attitude of the gentleman from Illinois on the supplemental item back in January of \$24 million. I do not propose to be a party to leaving it to his judgment when we have an opportunity here for the Members of the committee to write this additional amount into the appropriation bill at the present time.

Why bother with the supplemental appropriation? The head of that Department, Mrs. Hobby, has indicated that she needs \$66,500,000. I am certain they know more about it than the gentleman from Illinois, and members of the subcommittee, at least as to what they need.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. HALE. My people are very much interested in renewal legislation of Public Law 815. The gentleman has said it will receive consideration from his committee. Does the gentleman feel fairly positive that a new bill will be on the floor, or ought to be on the floor in the next 2 weeks, if it is really to be taken care of?

Mr. BAILEY. I answer the gentleman by saying the chairman of the committee has indicated that as soon as a number of executive-session hearings of the committee are disposed of, we will take up the education bill immediately.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could come to some agreement on limiting debate on this amendment. Could we agree on 15 minutes?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object. We are meeting today not because I wanted to, but with the understanding that we would have plenty of time. I can go along on this situation and be pretty decent about it, but if you are going to start closing debate by force, we are going to have several quorum calls here today.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think the gentleman is a little in error in his anticipation, because I do not think I have ever been accused of trying any such thing as that.

Mr. FOGARTY. No, no; I did not mean you, and I am sorry if you thought I meant that because you have been very cooperative in all these hearings that we have held. I am sorry if you think that, and I did not mean to intimate that about you in any way.

Mr. BUSBEY. Can we agree on 20 minutes?



Mr. FOGARTY. No; I do not think so.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to make an announcement. I do propose to object to anyone taking time on amendments in cases like this, and then yielding their time wholesale to various other Members so that they can have an advantage over someone. I do not think that is entirely fair. I think if Members ask for the time, they should be required to use the time. That is the main thing, and I think we should adhere to the rules of the House. Can we not limit debate to 30 minutes?

Mr. FOGARTY. There are at least 15 Members standing.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry but I feel constrained to move that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 30 minutes, and do so move.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY), there were—ayes 65, noes 52.

So the motion was agreed to.

(Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, at this point in this very important debate, the results of which will indelibly mark the destiny of millions of Americans now alive, as well as millions yet unborn, and, because I so strongly believe that as the health, education, labor, and welfare of the average American citizen is, so is the internal happiness and real prosperity of our Nation, I feel I must urge to your consideration just a few points which I believe to be determinative factors for your reasonable judgment.

In stating my premises for strongly advocating against the subcommittee's cuts, I am much aware of my own personal position for economy in all departments and agencies of our Federal Government. Also, I give credit to every other Member for not being any less economy minded than am I. During these more than 6 years that I have now had the responsibility of membership in this great legislative body, I have frequently made it clear that I urge that the national budget be balanced and kept in balance as nearly as possible, consistent with our national security and defense; and, with the general welfare of all the American people. The last administration admitted it could not balance the budget on account of commonly recognized international stresses and strains, largely emanating from aggressive and subversive communistic policies. Just a few days ago our new administration, through the considered words of President Eisenhower, advised the American people that this present administration saw no chance the next fiscal year of keeping up with its campaign-expressed language on this subject.

I commend the subcommittee for its diligent endeavor and advice to us. But frankly, Mr. Chairman, I have not during this debate heard any argument sup-

ported by ample evidence, to convince me that this Congress ought to cut below the figure asked for by President Eisenhower and his chosen advisors. It is not clear to me why our Republican-controlled committee feels it wise or necessary to cut down the Eisenhower requests by several millions of dollars. Yet, that is what is being done in the very area of daily living of American citizens where it will hurt millions of Americans most. I refer to a people's work; their health, their education, their welfare. Is there any level of activity or of daily experiences or necessities that come closer to an American family than do these? Yes, I admit actual bread and butter probably do. This being true, to reduce or remove any opportunities or protection presently enjoyed in these areas is, in my judgment exceedingly poor judgment, unwise planning, and instead of being tax-dollar economy, is in fact a tax-dollar expense. Such theoretical tax-dollar saving is in fact, starting in motion an actual, fast-rolling-tax-dollar liability.

Granting that Congress has a responsibility, even when President Eisenhower has sent us his carefully considered requests and desires, if the arguments on the majority side that the last election was primarily expression of confidence of the American people in President Eisenhower is well founded, then logically Congress should give our new President the money he asks for in the Department of Labor and in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which two Departments we are now discussing. In view of his promises to cut the "fat" out of budgets every place possible, I am unwilling to believe these two strategically important Departments can do the job assigned to them and yet absorb these committee cuts. I have heard no convincing evidence from the committee that they could.

Let us look at the cuts proposed in the Labor Department. Mr. Chairman, I believe anything which cripples an adequate apprenticeship program cripples a guarantee of adequate production in our industrial life and stability. Yet the committee cuts \$700,000 below what President Eisenhower asked for.

And taking another sum of \$767,000 from the President's request for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Employment certainly cannot but also lessen efficiency in this necessary bureau.

But to take \$30,700,000 from the grants to the States for unemployment compensation and employment services administration, without at least first giving the States adequate notice they can try to provide these funds, is again unwise and unfair.

And then, to cut \$6 million off the President's request for funds to handle unemployment compensation for veterans in the States; this again comes prematurely and unwisely.

The cut of \$689,000 in the vital Bureau of Labor Statistics is again shocking in its possibilities to the whole Nation while the cut of \$60,000 in the Women's Bureau is again further evidence of lack of soundest judgment. And the cut of \$1,639,000 below the Pres-

ident's request again cannot but indicate of lack of emphasis in one of the very places which should always be amply prepared.

Mr. Chairman, while I gladly assume no member of the House would willingly cut out moneys where they should not be cut, it is not comforting for me to see the Department of Labor, an early object of such extreme and extensive cuts. Most of the American people are working people; laboring with honor and industry. So, what weakens the Department of Labor relates directly—very directly—to the welfare of most of the American people.

I oppose these cuts proposed by the Committee. President Eisenhower should have at least the money he said he needed to do a good job.

Freedmen's Hospital service in the District of Columbia is a 24-hour-a-day necessity and there is no need nor justification for cutting \$446,000 from the request. It is the only hospital in the District serving our deserving Negro citizens without fee. It also is a place of experience and professional training for nurses and doctors. I have heard no justification for this treatment. I cannot find any. It is very, very poor judgment, I believe, to cut it. It needs a real face lifting and repairs.

And, to cut \$510,000 from the request for Howard University, which has proven such a blessing to Negro students ever since about 2 years after the Civil War, is again a shocking proposal. No one can gainsay that the Negro boys and girls have taken advantage of the school offered. They pay almost \$300 a year tuition and over 16,000 have there graduated and it offers more adequate opportunities, instead of fewer, for education is a wise investment.

And to cut \$2,624,391 from the budget requested for further development of vocational education is another rash and poorly considered action. Millions of American boys and girls never have and never will sit in college classes. But, they can learn to earn adequate and honorable livelihood in this vocational education activity.

And to cut \$2,400,000 from the request for vocational rehabilitation without notice to the States involved is again unfair and unwise. No doubt the States should shoulder their full share of the responsibility but we should not shirk ours.

To cut \$9,500,000 from the request for payments to school districts which are commonly called impacted is clearly unfair to thousands of school districts, alone unable to absorb the population which comes to them as a result of Federal installations and activities in the school district.

In the great 23d congressional district of Los Angeles County, Calif., are more than one school district which has more than one school district which has already used up all of their legal resources to try to give all the children who come to them a fair chance for schooling. But thousands of these children are primarily Federal responsibilities as contrasted with local responsibilities. Their coming and creating



these "impacted" districts is not at the request of these already overburdened local school districts. Under Public Law 874, under the rules of common fairness and equity, we must not make this unwarranted act.

But my time is running out. I would speak in opposition to all these cuts which dig deep into the daily hearts and bodies and spirits and souls of everyday Americans. Yes, let us economize. Let us do it vigilantly and soundly. But, Mr. Chairman, let us not magnify the almighty dollar to such extent that we put cash above character. Mr. Speaker, it is not dollar economy to either increase illiteracy or lack of educational opportunity or to increase hazards to public health; or to make more injurious or less fair, working conditions. Yet, Mr. Chairman, these are but a few of the bad and certain results of these cuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of confusion has arisen in the matter of these funds for the operation and maintenance of schools in areas impacted by the defense effort on account of certain statements which have been made that are without proper basis.

The schools are now going into their vacation period. It will not be until September, after this bill is passed, before the full entitlement of qualified schools can be computed, not until the school authorities know what their enrollment will be. They cannot go ahead with their programs to contract for teachers or expand their facilities, and so forth, for the next school year unless they know whether the money is going to be available. That is why only some \$20 million of this year's appropriations have been committed. They will all be asked for within the next 60 days.

You will remember the great embarrassment that we caused the school systems last year by putting this off. We eventually had to provide money in a supplemental appropriation bill. It came late. Let us not repeat that error again.

I may say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] that my city may not be a big city in the sense of his city of Chicago, but it is a city of 65,000 and it exhausted all of its resources for school purposes before it called upon the Federal Government for aid. Unless this aid is forthcoming it cannot continue to carry the load imposed on it by the location of shipyards, a great naval air station, an Army medical supply base, and the presence of other defense establishments.

We have been through all of this before. All that it does is create confusion in the minds of the school administrators and distrust of the Federal Government. Here is one obligation that we recognize, and one obligation that the Government must accept.

I ask that the amendment be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK].

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fogarty amendment to increase the item "Payments to school districts" to the amount of the Eisenhower budget.

I just want to say a word in reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], who said a little while ago that the atomic energy project in southern Ohio, known as the Portsmouth-Chillicothe project would be abandoned. It is in progress. A tremendous amount of work has already been done. Vast sums of money have been spent on it. I am sure if the gentleman from Illinois would investigate the facts he would find there is no move on foot to abandon that project. There was an article in the papers 2 or 3 days ago saying that the project was to be abandoned, but it is in the district I have the privilege to represent, and I have investigated the matter thoroughly and from the information I have the project will be carried on to completion.

May I say that the school districts in this area are in very difficult financial condition. I have the figures in my office showing that there are some 8,500 students in that area who will be unhoused. So I was glad to hear the gentleman say that he planned to offer in the next supplemental bill an item for school buildings, because they are seriously needed in the area. It is a very seriously impacted area because of this Federal project. I hope the committee will support the gentleman from Rhode Island in his effort to bring this appropriation up to the amount recommended by President Eisenhower.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK] has given the House the true situation in regard to the Portsmouth, Ohio, plant. This was a matter of concern to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. We took the matter up with the Commission and the Commission has not recommended a substantial curtailment. I do not know why this reduction was made unless the Committee on Appropriations intends to curtail this new development of atomic energy.

I see no substantial point in the gentleman from Illinois reading that so-called newspaper report.

Many of these impacted areas are outside of large cities. There happens to be one outside the city of Los Angeles, but within my congressional district. It is a little area known as the Norwalk School District. It jumped from a population of 7,500 in the last 4 years to over 54,000 people, and most of this has been a result of the tremendous defense plants expansion in that area. The imposition of these thousands of new schoolchildren on this school district is a burden impossible for the local popu-

lation to meet. We must have some help. These appropriations are for the benefit of the United States. The great defense projects, wherever they may be, are Federal responsibilities; they represent burdens which the small local areas cannot bear. Most of these plants are out in outlying areas. I certainly want to commend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] in bringing this original law to the Congress; and I believe along with the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] that the full entitlements will not come in for consideration until September. I therefore support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island to raise this \$6 million which is in accord with the Eisenhower budget and is in accord with the request of Mrs. Hobby.

I hope the Fogarty amendment will be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, if there is anything on earth that this Congress has ever considered in the 13 years in which I have served here, that was non-political, it was the authorization making appropriations of this nature in order. There is not the slightest, single iota of politics in this appropriation. This is one thing that has transcended politics from its inception. The areas affected by this appropriation were overrun by the activities of the Federal Government, and you will recall, you were here during the war years, each year we had to fight the Appropriations Committee—and we did have to fight to get the funds to take care of these areas. The Congress finally got tired of going through those tactics each time the appropriations came up and the Congress sent a committee throughout the length and breadth of this country to investigate these impacted areas. It was a bipartisan group. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor served on that committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL], and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], was chairman. The committee went throughout the entire Nation and found these areas were absolutely overrun by the activities of the Federal Government and that the local and State officials were financially unable because of constitutional limitations to provide for them. We made appropriations in keeping with the two statutes which were referred to by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia. If there is any appropriation which is needed and which stops the creeping specter of socialism which we all have decried, it is this type of thing to give to communities unable to care for their overrun, impacted conditions because of these Federal installations—it is this type of bill. I do not see how anyone could possibly oppose this appropriation in keeping with the recommendation of the President of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].



(Mr. DEMPSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we should find it unnecessary to consider very long the matter now before us. We solicited the States to cooperate with the Federal Government to the end that school children going into the different States by reason of these war installations might be educated. The Government has a contract with the States.

The most telling point in the opinion of the gentleman from Illinois, chairman of this subcommittee, is that no large city is getting a portion of that money. So far as we in New Mexico are concerned we would be happy if Chicago, New York or one of the other large cities had the project which we now have in New Mexico. It is 90 miles long and 30 miles wide. The cattle growers who owned the land did not ask the Government to come in and take it over and, as a matter of fact, the Government had to go to the Supreme Court to condemn this property and put these ranchers off their land. It is now one of the most important testing grounds we have in America and is playing a vital part in our defense program. However, the number of children who came into that area because of that Federal Government activity is not small. They have filled our schools far beyond the overflowing point.

The little towns themselves could not possibly supply the schools nor the teachers which we have supplied by reason of a contract with the Federal Government. When people get in bad financial straits they settle for so much on the dollar, but I do not think Uncle Sam has reached that point yet. I was surprised when the gentleman from Rhode Island said that with the \$60 million the committee wishes to give to the States you could settle for about 90 cents on the dollar. I do not believe the Congress of the United States wants to settle its word on the basis of a discount on the dollar. I am strongly in favor of the amendment because, for one reason, I believe that when the Federal Government makes an agreement with the States it should keep faith and live up to the agreement just as the States are doing. We should keep our promises.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fogarty amendment. It is necessary that we adopt this amendment if we are to have an orderly operation of our schools in the impacted areas of this Nation. I was a member of the committee at the time the basic legislation was studied, and supported the measure at that time. In view of the supplemental appropriations bill passed a few weeks ago, I cannot see where the amendment can be controversial if we favor the program.

Schools, like Fort Knox, Ky., on Government installations will not be affected

because those schools will receive their money first as the law provides. The balance then will be distributed among the other qualified school districts. According to the amount expended for fiscal 1953, the remainder will not be adequate to pay as much as 90 percent of the entitlements. This is not taking into consideration the new development in the Portsmouth area, the atomic development that has taken place down there within the last year.

In the affected areas in Kentucky—and the same holds true throughout the country—you will find that the local boards of education have entered into contracts with teachers and incurred other maintenance and operating expenses based upon 100 percent of entitlements.

Let us take the area surrounding Fort Knox, Ky., as an illustration. Now, if we deny those areas the money, you can readily see that chaos and confusion will result. The Government is entirely responsible for the conditions existing in and around these impacted areas. It is our duty to pay our just debt to the schools in accordance with the entitlements resulting from the basic law, especially, this is true today in the affected areas.

I am glad that I have always supported the maintenance and operation program and the school-construction program for the impacted areas. This amendment is sound and should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

(Mr. HAGEN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I earnestly urge support of the Fogarty amendment. It will be recalled that during the war Prime Minister Churchill said that he was not elected Prime Minister of England to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. I do not think that Mrs. Hobby, who has been elevated to Cabinet status, has been appointed to preside over the liquidation of her new Department. If so, we should rename it the Department of Empty Promises because the committee certainly has unreasonably cut its budget.

We, in California, have a particular stake in this appropriation. As a matter of fact, California receives the leading amount of money in this program. I served in the California State Legislature, and we meet our school problems head on. We do not legislate by indirection. If we do not feel that the schools are entitled to the money, and we do not have it, we change the formula. We are not changing the formula here. We are legislating by indirection because, as I understand, this amounts to approximately a 42-percent cut of this program to California's affected districts. You are slashing the aid to these needy districts by 42 percent.

In my district I have a school district which is doing a good job, which derives 50 percent of its budget from this program. It could not possibly raise that money otherwise, because outside of the

Federal installation, which is a military one, there is only a small community and sagebrush and jackrabbits, and when you say to that district, "We are going to cut this budget by 42 percent" you are telling them that they cannot educate their children in the way that their children are entitled to be educated.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the Fogarty amendment be adopted, and I particularly urge that upon the gentlemen from California and the gentlemen from Texas because those two States participate to the largest degree in this program.

(Mr. MOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in the views expressed by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN], in urging approval of the Fogarty amendment. California has not at any time come to this Congress and asked for special help to meet its educational needs. Instead, since the war, our people have voted over \$430 million in bonds to help school districts meet the problem of housing youngsters. Our local school districts in almost every instance are at a maximum legal bonding rate and a maximum legal tax rate. The majority of the school districts of California exceeded, by special vote of the people, their legal tax and bonding rates in an attempt to meet the educational problems. Defense activities have made a tremendous impact on the schools of our State. If we are going to solve our school problems we must get the help we are entitled to receive—entitled, because we are carrying on a program of national interest in the defense activities. We must have the full measure of assistance permitted by previous actions of the Congress.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The law is very specific, and the action of the committee in cutting out these moneys, or reducing them, is an effort to repeal or amend that law by indirection. The proper thing to do, if they want to amend the law, is to go to the legislature and do it there.

Mr. MOSS. I quite agree with the gentleman. It is an obligation, and if we fail to meet it, we will do irreparable damage to many young men and women in our schools today.

The Congress offered to pay for a share of the educational burden placed on the schools by the Federal defense installations which brought thousands of families all with children to be educated into the local school districts. The schools of California set up their educational programs in anticipation of this deserved and needed Federal aid. The Eisenhower budget includes the money to finance the program. Now the committee proposes cutting the amount of aid by 10 percent.

If we approved the committee's proposal we would be financing only 90 per-



cent of a job which must be done 100 percent. We are not juggling dollars or talking about statistics here, but we are gambling with the future of our children. I cannot urge you too strongly to approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island and provide enough money to do a 100 percent job of educating the children of our defense workers.

(Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit surprised that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] continues to snipe at this program when he got such a good lesson early this year that this is a bipartisan matter and is not a partisan matter at all. I am sure when the vote comes the people on his side who have these conditions existing in their districts are going to vote just as we on this side who have been making most of the speeches on this amendment. There is nothing discriminatory about this law at all. In the first place, I think it is the most carefully considered legislation that has been passed by this Congress since I have been here. I say this because of the fact that a subcommittee toured this whole country studying the school situation in Government-impacted areas. Most of the members of this committee did not have impacted areas in their districts. They came up with a piece of legislation that was carefully considered on the floor of this House and passed.

Right here I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], and the other members of this subcommittee for the fine piece of work they did on both Public Laws 874 and 815. That was constructive legislation. Now we have the attempt to hamstring it and hamper it, knowing that in the end we are going to live up to our obligation and to the promises we have made to these school people, and appropriate these funds. Eventually, why not now?

Moreover, another proof that this legislative program is not discriminatory is the fact that President Eisenhower approved it and asked for adequate appropriations to implement it. Besides, Mrs. Hobby has asked for just the amount we are pleading for.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is adopted.

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to restore funds eliminated by the committee for payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the act of September 30, 1950—Public Law 874.

Most of the defense plants in Alabama are concentrated in the 4th District, which I have the high honor to represent. At one installation, and I speak of

the Anniston Ordnance Depot at Bynum, Ala., we have practically doubled the number of personnel since the outbreak of the war in Korea. Many of the families live on the installation and, therefore, have no taxable property which is subject to a school district tax. This same situation applied to Fort McClellan, Ala., and to Craig Air Force Base in Selma, Ala., where many of the defense workers and military personnel live on the reservation.

I feel that the Federal emergency is just as great as it has ever been and that to neglect the education of these children who have no choice about where they are to live will not only be unfair to my section of the country but is a short-sighted, penny-wise and pound-foolish policy which must be corrected. I do not believe that it is in keeping with the President's views as outlined in his state of the Union message and I cannot believe that such a policy can result in anything but a weakening of our national preparedness program.

I have lived near a military installation all of my life and I know from my contacts with military people and people in defense work that the morale of these people is highly important. Good relations with the local communities and school authorities can only be maintained when the proper attention is given to the health, education, and welfare of the people who, because of circumstances beyond their control, are forced to live and work in communities not always of their own selection. I believe in economy and I feel that there are many places in the Federal Government where we can do a lot of needed trimming; but to strike at the school children of America and to strike at communities which are already overburdened because of defense activities is not economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Fogarty amendment, but I take this time primarily to inquire of the gentleman from Rhode Island, author of the amendment; if we fail to appropriate as much money as the entitlements add up to, just what will happen?

Mr. FOGARTY. It means that they have 1 or 2 things to do. They can prorate this amount we give them of \$60 million to all the school districts, which would mean that they would meet only between 85 and 90 percent of the entitlements that are due them; or else they could come back, as they have in other years, for a deficiency, and next January or February we could give them a deficiency amount to meet these entitlements.

Another thing, I think I should remind the gentleman that a statement was made that only twenty-some million dollars had been obligated. I think everyone who knows the bill itself knows that they cannot obligate these moneys at an advance date because they have to wait until the end of the school year. These funds are obligated on the basis of the per day child attendance at these schools. That is why the funds are not obligated. Sometimes it is August or

September before these payments are made, because we have to get that information.

Mr. ALBERT. May I ask the gentleman another question? New installations are coming into operation this summer and probably have not been fully figured in the departmental estimates. Will an appropriation of \$66.5 million properly take care of those school districts in communities where new defense establishments will come into operation this summer?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, it will not.

Mr. ALBERT. In other words, we may still have a deficiency even if we adopt the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. I shall certainly support his amendment. We would do better, I think, to go even further and allow the Truman budget in full.

[Mr. LONG addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment to restore \$6 million to the budget for aid to school construction in federally impacted areas.

Where the population of school districts has been mushroomed by the business of Government, that business must contribute its fair share toward the maintenance of schools and other facilities in those districts. The tax from residential property is reaching the point of confiscation in those areas which have grown up overnight because of Government activities. The Federal Government must carry its share of this burden.

I am opposed to Federal aid to education on a general basis. The answer to this problem is to cut down on the expansion of Federal activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in the unaccustomed position since the convening of this Congress of coming to the well of the House for a second time to ask for an increase in appropriations. But as I stated here last Friday, I would not be making this request if it were in the interest of some pressure group composed of adult Americans. This money is to be spent in the interest of American children. I would like to emphasize the word American. I have said in the well of the House before in discussing this same program that perhaps the shortest cut and the easiest and most effective approach for these school officials in the various impacted areas throughout the land to take in order to get funds with which to educate these transient children would be, if by some means, by some hook or crook, they could find who it is who is running the State Department and get that person or those people to designate a particular area as being foreign territory. Then they would have no difficulty whatsoever in applying to this outfit up here at Lake Failure, and getting



all the money they need. It seems to me unthinkable that you will quibble over \$5 million or \$6 million to be spent on American children, when by your own admission, you have already admitted that you have no hope or intention of balancing the budget or reducing taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, may I justify my second appearance before the committee by saying that I was assigned to do a job as chairman of a special committee of the House Committee on Education and Labor. In the case of Public Laws 815 and 874 I have endeavored to do as good a job as it was possible to do, and we think we did an excellent job.

May I say to my colleagues of the committee that this legislation means nothing to me other than that as a former schoolman I am a person who has the welfare of the boys and girls at heart. Not a single cent of this money comes to my district in West Virginia, and in the entire State of West Virginia last year under this program, we received \$24,117. So I want you to understand that all I have done in helping the program and this legislation has been done because I want to see the boys and girls of this country properly educated.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Does this appropriation of \$66 million include the salaries of teachers if it should become necessary to hire additional teachers for the maintenance and operation of the schools?

Mr. BAILEY. That is exactly right. Most of these teachers have been hired and the school boards have them on their hands. If we do not give them an adequate amount of money to carry out the commitments of the Government, those teachers will have a proper claim against the board of education on their contracts. This is a matter of business, and it is no time to talk about economizing in a program of this kind. Let me say to the gentleman, and I will say it in all sincerity, I will vote against every cent of foreign commitment for economic aid if you will restore these items here that concern our boys and girls, and I will vote an open ballot on the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it does not make any difference what a program is or how good it is or how needful it is. The only question is what is needed, and what can honestly and intelligently be used. This year with an appropriation of \$60,500,000 down through the 30th of April, the obligations only amounted to \$24,107,224, leaving upward of \$36 million unobligated.

The total expenditures down to that date were only \$19,375,955, indicating that there is absolutely no need anywhere for more money than this committee has recommended.

Frankly, these figures were not available at the time the revised budget was prepared and the committee allowed \$60,500,000 the same as last year. They only became available recently. These figures were obtained from the Department of Education this morning by our clerk. How can anybody honestly and fairly think of such a thing as voting for a dollar more than the committee has recommended. Frankly, I appeal to the House of Representatives to be honest in casting its vote here and do what they think they ought to do. We cannot hope to give them more money than they can honestly use.

I hope this amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fourteen Members are present; a quorum.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 65, noes 65.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. BUSBEY and Mr. FOGARTY.

The Committee divided.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], when she was passing through, claimed that I had dropped 10, that instead of saying 49 I said 39.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, is there any method by which the vote can be had again when it has once been taken by tellers?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would object to that. It cannot be done except by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is a doubt on the part of the tellers about the count, it can be taken again, the Chair will rule.

Mr. RAYBURN. This is the first time I ever heard of that.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, we will pick it up on the rollcall, so let it go.

The tellers reported that there were—ayes 99, noes 87.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### Office of Vocational Rehabilitation

Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4), including payments, in accordance

with regulations of the Secretary, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accordance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said act for the use of blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be controlled by the State agency, \$20,600,000, of which not to exceed \$175,000 shall be available to the Secretary for providing rehabilitation services to disabled residents of the District of Columbia, as authorized by section 6 of said act, which latter amount shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with providing such services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15 percent of the appropriation shall be used for administrative purposes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: Page 15, line 14, strike out "\$20,600,000" and insert "\$23,000,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, since I have been on this committee it has been testified year after year that this is one of the agencies of government that makes money for the Federal Government. It is an agency that for every dollar we appropriate in Federal dollars we get at least \$10 back. That is a conservative estimate. The estimate that I have been able to get to be the more correct estimate is that it is nearer \$14 or \$15 for every dollar we appropriate that we get back in one form or another into the Federal Treasury of the United States. Why in the world the committee saw fit to cut this particular agency which rehabilitates people who were unfortunate enough to be born disabled or to have received an accident that prevents them from making a living at the present time, I do not know. We are today rehabilitating in the neighborhood of 60,000 people a year. This bill includes \$20,600,000, or a reduction of \$2,400,000.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Is not the money provided for in this item used on a matching basis in many of the States?

Mr. FOGARTY. It is on some services, but not all. In some instances the Federal Government pays 100 percent for some of the services.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to back up the gentleman on what he has had to say relative to the worthwhileness of this particular program. I believe it is one of the most meritorious sections in the bill and personally I hope to see his amendment adopted.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have a telegram from the Governor of our State urging that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think every governor of every State of the Union is for this particular appropriation.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?



Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Does this appropriation contain money to buy equipment for the blind; newspapers, and so on?

Mr. FOGARTY. It certainly does.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the cold facts are that if we allow this \$2,400,000 cut to stand, it means that 6,800 people who would have been rehabilitated under the regular appropriation bill will not be rehabilitated in this coming fiscal year. If you want to vote for this cut of \$2,400,000 it means that we are saying to about 7,000 unfortunate people of this country that you do not want them rehabilitated.

Secondly, it means \$1,750,000 Federal income taxes annually. If those nearly 7,000 people were to be rehabilitated in the fiscal year 1954, it would mean that the Federal Treasury would gain \$1,750,000. It means to those 6,800 people \$12 million in earnings in the fiscal year 1954. If we rehabilitate those 6,800 people by adopting this amendment I am offering today, you will be saying to those 6,800 people that "We are going to allow you to earn \$12 million for yourselves in the fiscal year 1954." It means 12 million man-hours of production if these 6,800 people are rehabilitated. And, last, it means if this amendment is not adopted, that about 1,400 of these 6,800 lost rehabilitants would be on public assistance and would draw about \$1 million in relief grants per year. So, all in all, it would be a loss to the Federal Treasury if we did not appropriate this additional \$2,400,000.

There has been testimony year after year of the good work this Commission has been doing for these unfortunate people. It has been taking people off relief rolls on the local level and getting them to a position where they can handle a job themselves and in their own way, and at the same time pay taxes.

One of the reasons given by the committee was a report by some investigators who were sent down there to look at some auditor's reports. They gave three examples in the report, and I wish you would look at it. I have had a chance to have these three charges investigated. There is not a thing in the charges that have been made by these investigators that we have mentioned in our report that sustains anything. I do not know who the investigators were that went down there. I do know they came in with a report about 2 days before we marked up the bill. I do know that when we were marking up the bill the report of these investigators was given no consideration in our meeting at all. Much to my surprise, I read of the three cases that were picked out for some reason or other and put into the report, and I did not see it until the full committee met at 10:30 that morning. But I know there are other Members of Congress who know personally of these three cases they have mentioned. There are other cases I know which would take time to explain, but I have an answer, if an answer is not made by the Members in their own districts, to the charges that have been made by these investigators. We do not know anything about their

background at all. We do not know how much time they spent. We do not know if they went into the States where the people were and asked about them back there.

If we are going to have reports by investigators of any committee of our House reprinted in a report that is before you, I think we should have all the facts. I think those investigators should not be going down there only to look at a report of an auditor but should make a decision themselves. They should go back to the source and find out for themselves from the source in the State or the city as to just what happened to this particular case or that particular case. If the investigators had done that, I am sure these three examples would not be in the report at the present time.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

When I first came here 11 years ago, I was privileged to serve as a member of the Committee on Education, of which the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] was the chairman. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act was the first bill on which I worked as a new Member of Congress. Therefore, I have had a special interest in following its operations and remarkable success during these years. There is no piece of legislation that I have had anything to do with which has given me greater satisfaction. Literally thousands and thousands of persons who were on public relief, have been restored to useful citizenship. They have jobs, are earning salaries or wages, are supporting their families, and are paying taxes back into the Federal Treasury.

May I deal with some of the objections that have been raised. It has been charged that the States apparently do not approve of this program because they are paying only 34 percent of it. If you examine the Act, you find the Federal Government was to provide all the necessary administrative and guidance costs as well as—

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. In the first place, I will state I expect to support this amendment on purely economic grounds, but I should like to ask whether there is any question of humanity or Christian conduct involved in this question.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, indeed, and I am sure we are all motivated by it, but if we ignore all such considerations, this is a plain case of where we more than get our money back as well as make as great a contribution as any program in our whole country to the development of the finest kind of self-reliant and self-supporting American citizens.

Let me get back to the question of division of funds between State and Federal Governments. In the act, it was provided that the necessary administrative and guidance costs of the program would be paid out of Federal funds, plus one-half of the service costs. So that it is not possible for any State to get to the point where it provides half of the total costs. In the beginning, the

Federal Government provided 72 percent of the funds. That is now down to about 65 percent because the States have increased their contributions. The legislature of my own State of Minnesota, before it adjourned in April, increased its appropriations for this program. I have a letter from the man who handles it in my home town of Minneapolis. He is one of only 16 counsellors for the whole State. This is what he says:

I have 250 names on my waiting list. Each of those names represents a man, a family, and the discouragement born of inability to work. I can help those men get back to work, but only one at a time. I could handle the job, maybe keep even, if I were triplets.

That is under the present program. Unless you adopt this amendment, it will be cut down to something still less. The letter continues:

I am the only counselor for the vocationally handicapped adults in a city of a half million. Meanwhile those men are not working. They do not earn, but they consume public funds.

As the gentleman from Kansas just said, that is poor economy.

Last year 65,000 people were rehabilitated under this program and given vocational training so that they could get jobs. They increased their earnings by over \$82 million in the first year after rehabilitation. It is estimated that by 1955 they will have paid in Federal income taxes alone the entire \$21 million that the Federal Government has spent in their rehabilitation. By 1955 they will have paid back in taxes all that was put into their training, plus the contributions that they will have made to our whole economy and the well-being of their communities.

Consider this, too. Twelve thousand of these 65,000 were taken directly from relief rolls. The average cost of rehabilitation was \$457 a man, and they were consuming more money than that each year in public assistance. So it is perfectly clear that the more rehabilitation we carry out, the less public assistance we have to pay, and, conversely, the less we carry out in rehabilitation, the more money we all pay for public assistance. This is just one of the reasons this is one of the soundest programs that the Congress ever adopted. It converts tax-eaters into taxpayers. I hope that the amendment will be supported.

If I have a minute or two left, I want to refer to another objection that has been raised. It has been said there has been improper administration, because training was given to certain cases unsuited for it. That is inevitable in a program of this size. For perhaps 95 percent of the cases, there is no question that the man is suitable. He is blind or has a hand or a leg missing, but is otherwise sound. Obviously he needs to be and can be rehabilitated. But there are some borderline cases, not so clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.



There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. There are bound to be a certain number of cases on the borderline, where some mistakes of judgment will be made. It is the same as in the Veterans' Administration, where the adjudicators have to decide in the case of John Jones, first, whether his disability is or is not compensable, and, second, if it is compensable, what degree or what percentage of disability exists. Those are decisions requiring individual judgment, and in a few percent of such cases there is bound to be an occasional error of judgment that does not discredit the program. I would rather err on the side of giving vocational training during a year to a few score persons who do not need it than fail to give it to some 6,800 who do need it and who will not get it unless the amendment is adopted.

There is another reason why some errors take place. When we wrote this act, in 1943, our committee was on guard against Federal control of any State rehabilitation, training, or education and other educational program. We wrote restrictions into the bill so that the Federal Government could not exercise control over the 48 States. That means that in some State here or there, there may be an official who misuses his powers and leans too far toward granting rehabilitation to people who cannot use it well. I am willing to pay that price rather than have power concentrated in Washington to dictate to the States, under the plan agreed upon when the program is started in a State. If power to make all decisions is in Washington and an official here goes wrong, it may involve the whole country. On my side of the aisle we are always talking about preventing centralization of power in Washington. This is a case where the Congress deliberately wrote into the bill provisions which make it impossible for the Federal Government to run or control the States. That means that although there may be an occasional error in a particular State, it is infinitesimal as compared to the total value of the program.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that anybody who has examined the facts in his own State will vote for this amendment to raise the appropriation to the figure that was originally estimated in both the Truman and the Eisenhower budgets.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported the committee without exception on all of the amendments which have been offered to the bill. As a member of the committee, I feel the chairman and members of this committee have done a very good job, and have recommended all of the money that could justly be spent for all of the functions contained in this bill.

There has been some maladministration in this particular program of vocational rehabilitation. If the committee had taken the word for all of the criticism that came to the attention of the committee, they may have recommended

much less, and possibly would have been justified; but, generally speaking, the program has been carried on in a manner which is creditable in most instances. It is a very necessary program. It has rehabilitated a great many folks and put them back to work and taken them off the relief rolls in every State of the Union.

As I said a few days ago, it is easy to make a speech which touches the heart of every American, including my own, on matters of this nature. Of course, there are many things for which the Federal Government must help do, and we must take care of those very necessary things. This is one of them; but, after all, there is a limit to what can be spent.

In defense of the program in the State of Iowa, I want to say that the certified public accountants who examined the books and looked into the administration of this program in our State, Griffenhagen & Associates, consultants in public administration and finance, had this to say in their report about how the program was administered in the State of Iowa:

The standards of procedures and the techniques of administration used by this division are superior to those used generally throughout the other divisions. Extensive work has been done in the development and utilization of manuals of standard practice instructions. This excellent work is continuing and might well serve as a model for other divisions and other departments of the State government.

I am quite proud of the fact that this program in my State received this fine recognition and I congratulate the people in charge of this program for Iowa.

I read that statement so that no onus will be pointed at the administration of this program in the State of Iowa.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER], this is not a very familiar role for me. This is the first time, in fact, that I have stood before this House since the 80th Congress to ask for an increase in an appropriation measure. I am compelled to do so in this instance, though, because in the first place I recognize this particular expenditure as good business for the Government. In the second place, I recognize it as much needed to carry out a very worthwhile program.

It seems odd to me that during the period of the last 5 or 6 years, we should have appropriated almost \$50 billion to rehabilitate the countries of Europe—some of which several years ago were fighting us; yet refuse to spend this relatively small amount to rehabilitate unfortunate citizens of our country who

happen to have suffered physical disabilities.

Several weeks ago I visited an artificial limb shop in Mississippi. I had an artificial limb I wanted to get repaired. While they were doing the repair work, I noticed that most of the fellows working there were either 1-legged or 1-armed in fact, 1 of them did not have any legs but was walking on artificial limbs. None of them said they had been in the service so they were not entitled to veterans' benefits. One had been in an automobile wreck and lost his leg; others had been injured in various ways. I asked them where they learned their trade of making artificial limbs. They said they had trained for this work under the vocational-rehabilitation program. Today they are producers, where yesterday they had been nonproducers.

I am sure that the money those fellows have already paid in income tax has already paid the Government for the cost of the training they received under this program. That is but a typical example, not an isolated case. Go through practically any big newspaper plant, and you will see deaf printers and typesetters, all trained under this program. There are hundreds of typical cases. It is just good business to appropriate money to teach these unfortunate people to take care of themselves and become productive citizens.

Those who are helped by this program do not expect handouts; on the contrary, they are struggling to overcome their physical handicaps to take their places in society, not as wards but rather as contributors.

I know of no money that has ever been spent by Government that went for a better cause, or that contributed more proportionately to the general welfare. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

(Mr. THORNBERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned over the effect which the sharp reduction in funds for vocational rehabilitation will have on this very vital and necessary program.

I want to read to you a letter which I have received from Hon. Lon Alsup, executive secretary-director of the Texas State commissioner for the blind. I had the privilege of serving with Mr. Alsup in the Texas Legislature and I know that he is providing effective leadership in the Texas program for rehabilitation for the blind. He attaches a very interesting statement to his letter which I will insert in the RECORD:

STATE COMMISSION FOR THE BLIND,  
Austin, Tex., May 18, 1953.

Hon. HOMER THORNBERRY,  
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THORNBERRY: I trust that the attached letter will convince you of the need for vocational rehabilitation services to be continued at the same level that it is being administered at this time. Naturally, as executive secretary director of the State commission for the blind, I am concerned about the reduction of funds as recommended by the Committee on Labor and Education. According to press reports, the committee has submitted a report reducing current appropriations for vocational rehabilitation \$2,400,000 for the States. The



attached letter should convince you that rehabilitation pays off and that this reduction in funds for vocational rehabilitation is unnecessary.

I also sincerely request that you support an amendment to restore funds to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which will be offered when the bill is considered, probably on Thursday, May 21.

Thanking you for your sincere consideration of this matter and again hoping that you will support an amendment which will at least restore funds to the amount which the States are now receiving, I remain

Very truly yours,

LON ALSUP,  
Executive Secretary-Director.

MAY 14, 1953.

Mr. LARNIE E. JENNINGS,  
Editor, *the Powder Horn*,  
Personnel Division, Lone Star Ordnance Plant,  
Texarkana, Tex.

DEAR MR. JENNINGS: I want to express my sincere appreciation to you for allowing this letter to be placed in the *Powder Horn* in order that Mr. Lon Alsup, executive secretary director, the board members, and all employees of the Texas State Commission for the Blind may express our deepest gratitude and appreciation for the excellent cooperation and good will shown to this department by Mr. Autrey, personnel manager; Mr. Cooper, assistant personnel manager; Mr. Knox, chief interviewer; Mr. J. S. Peterson, director of production; Mr. E. B. Bryant, assistant to the director of production; Mr. A. A. Rowland, assistant director of production, and all other members of the personnel department, superintendents, and supervisors of the various production lines.

It has been very gratifying to this department to see so many visually handicapped individuals, both totally blind and partially sighted, be given an opportunity for employment on jobs on which they could perform with their limited vision as well as a person with normal vision.

In most instances we are prone to evaluate an item or items from a dollar-and-cents viewpoint. When the fine work that you people of the Lone Star Ordnance Plant have done is evaluated in this manner it makes a very impressive figure. For example, 16 of the individuals who are now working in areas C, E, and R, if they were unemployed would be drawing an aid to the needy-blind grant from the State department of public welfare, which is allowed for blind people who are unemployed and who cannot secure employment. The amount of this grant would be a maximum of \$55 per individual per month, or \$880 per month for this group. The remaining 5 of these people would also be eligible for a \$55 aid-to-the-needy blind grant, or a total of \$275 per month, plus aid-for-dependent-children grants for their families; since these 5 men have a total of 11 children who, when their fathers or main source of support is unemployed, makes these children eligible for aid from the State department of public welfare. The combined aid to dependent children's grants is \$276 per month. The \$55 per month for 1 individual is not a very impressive figure; however, when you multiply this \$55 by 21 you receive a total of \$1,155 per month which these people, if they were not working, would receive in the form of an aid-to-needy-blind grant. Then multiply this figure by 12 to cover a period of 1 year's time, you have a figure of \$13,860. When you add to this figure of \$276 per month, multiplied by 12, which is the amount being received under the aid to dependent children's grant, you have a figure of \$3,312 per year. When you add the total of the amount received for aid to needy blind and the amount received for aid to dependent children by this group of

people, if they were unemployed, you have the grand total of \$17,172 per year. This is the amount that these people would receive in forms of grants from welfare agencies, and, of course, paid by taxpayers, so we can consider this amount saved. When we add to this figure the amount of income tax which these people will pay over a period of a year's time, this amount being \$4,628 per year for the group of 21, you have a total of \$21,800. It is figures such as these that will indicate and convince one that rehabilitation is a paying business.

So far we have dealt only with the financial aspect of the picture. Add to the financial side of the picture the fact that 21 individuals have been given employment which will restore self-confidence and which will enable them to become useful citizens as well as taxpayers rather than tax consumers.

We sincerely hope that the facts and figures set out above will tell the story of what a wonderful job that the management and personnel of Lone Star Ordnance Plant have done. The State commission for the blind is very happy to have been a part of this work.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. HOLLINGER,  
Placement Counselor.

In addition to this letter from Mr. Alsup I have received the following telegrams:

HOUSTON, TEX.

HOMER THORNBERRY,  
House of Representatives,  
House Office Building:

Our understanding that Appropriations Committee has recommended \$2,500,000 cut for vocational rehabilitation which is part of Federal security appropriation. On behalf of handicapped children and young people of State, urgently request you work for restoration of funds as recommended by Bureau of Budget.

TEXAS VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION,  
JAMES C. TAYLOR, President.

AUSTIN, TEX., May 20, 1953.

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:

Please restore funds cut from appropriations recommended by Budget Committee for vocational rehabilitation in labor, health, education, and welfare bill. Support increase recommended by Budget Committee. Funds desperately needed.

CARL W. MOELLER,  
Vocational Rehabilitation Service.

I have also received a long-distance telephone call from Mr. M. A. Browning, the assistant commissioner of the State department of education, who has convinced me that the committee's proposed cut will seriously cripple the vocational rehabilitation program in Texas.

Because I believe in the long run more economy will be achieved in giving handicapped people an opportunity not only to earn a livelihood for themselves but to contribute to our economy, I urge adoption of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

(Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I must share responsibility for cuts that are recommended in this bill. With respect to vocational rehabilitation of crippled and blind adults, however, I fear that the committee has made a mistake. Based upon what I now know

about this program, I shall vote to restore the funds to the amount recommended in the Eisenhower budget.

I do not believe any State in the Union has made greater strides in rehabilitating its handicapped citizens during the last few years than has Pennsylvania, and I do not want to see this program set back by a cut in funds at this time. In fiscal 1951, the last year for which complete figures are available, 3,700 persons were rehabilitated in Pennsylvania, including 280 blind. A most significant factor is that more than 700 of these disabled people were taken from the public assistance rolls of the State saving the State about \$500,000 in relief cost the first year. In less than 5 years, these 700 handicapped persons would have drawn in public assistance more than was spent in rehabilitating them. And during the same period, they will pay in Federal income tax about \$1 million more. No doubt, many more of our handicapped were prevented from getting on relief rolls at all. This seems good business to me, and as long as the program can show such results, I think it should be encouraged.

The benefits of rehabilitation that we see in Pennsylvania are likewise apparent throughout the Nation. Sixty-five thousand people were rehabilitated in 1952 and 12,000 of these were taken from public assistance rolls or from public institutions.

Feeling that the people of Pennsylvania should do even more than at present for their handicapped citizens, the legislature is now considering a recommendation of the Governor that \$5 million be appropriated to build a rehabilitation center for the severely disabled, which will make it unnecessary that Pennsylvania send its disabled to other States for rehabilitation services.

With the rapid increase in our aged population and our physically and mentally handicapped people, much of it brought about by medical science's success in saving the lives of many who a few years ago would have passed away, it is now estimated that by 1980 each able-bodied person under 65 years of age will be supporting 1 person who is either over 65 years of age or disabled. Rehabilitation is a program that can help slow up this trend and eventually reverse it.

Despite the very evident need for economy in government, I do not believe that we should cut funds for vocational rehabilitation of our crippled and blind citizens. After all this is money spent to help people help themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to restore the cut made in funds for the vocational rehabilitation program. Why anyone would refuse to appropriate every dollar that can possibly be used on this program is beyond my comprehension. I received a pertinent telegram on this subject from the director of vocational rehabilitation of my own State. Under leave heretofore obtained in the House I insert a copy of this telegram as a part



of my remarks. The telegram reads as follows:

CARL ALBERT,

*Member of Congress,  
House of Representatives:*

Cut in appropriation recommended for vocational rehabilitation will deny services to 400 disabled persons and affect approximately 2,000 others in Oklahoma. Will also tend to increase cost of public assistance. Will deeply appreciate your active support of any amendment to restore the \$23 million in the Eisenhower budget.

VOYLE C. SPURLOCK,  
*Director Vocational Rehabilitation.*

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that what will happen under these reductions to the program in Oklahoma is typical of what will happen throughout the United States. Are we, in the name of penny-wise economy, going to deprive thousands of unfortunate Americans of the opportunity to become productive, self-reliant citizens? Are we going to say to them that we hold out for you not even a star of hope? Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the conscience of Members on behalf of people who only ask a chance to be able to help themselves.

Mr. Chairman, this cannot even be styled an economy move. If these people are not self-sufficient they will have to be supported by Government funds. Through the fine rehabilitation program which has grown up in this country many disabled men and women are tax-paying citizens, making their way and helping to support the high cost of national defense. Is it economy to swell the relief rolls with people who could well be on the tax rolls?

Mr. Chairman, in the name of real, basic economy; in the name of plain, simple humanity, I urge the House to support this amendment.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand here a message that came off the ticker a few minutes ago in which it is stated as follows:

WASHINGTON.—A witness today accused the House Appropriations Committee of casting discredit on the vocational-rehabilitation program without first getting the facts.

The testimony was given by H. L. Benshoof, director of vocational rehabilitation in Iowa, at a public hearing before a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee. The House committee had recommended a \$2,400,000 cut in the \$23 million rehabilitation appropriation recommended by the Eisenhower administration. The item is included in a health, education, and welfare money bill now pending in the House and on which the Senate subcommittee has started hearings.

Benshoof said the House committee made vague accusations of maladministration of the joint Federal-State rehabilitation program of training the physically handicapped to earn a living.

He asserted the criticism was based on findings of a House staff employee who "Had absolutely no training or experience in rehabilitation or related fields \* \* \* was not a physician and made no attempt to get medical advice from the examining physicians in these cases."

He said the employee examined the complete files in none of the criticized cases and interviewed none of the disabled persons involved.

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of things in this report with which I disagree violently. It is unfortunate but some of these things were not submitted to the other Members before being incorporated in the report.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to say that I am in favor of the pending amendment and believe it would be false economy to cripple this program.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot let this opportunity pass without commenting on a statement made on page 10 of the report in which reference is made to a young man who became Eastern intercollegiate wrestling champion while taking his training. I do not like a half truth and I do not think a half truth belongs in this or any other report.

That man was a policeman. After he was through with his police duties he assisted his father doing some work and stove an axe through his foot. They removed three toes. The axe and operation which followed left him with a wobbly foot.

At least three doctors, including a bone specialist, recommended the case to the Rehabilitation Service. He was accepted and went to school. He had powerful shoulders, he had powerful arms, he had a powerful back, and he did become an intercollegiate wrestling champion while he was taking this training. What is wrong with participating in athletics while going to school? I am proud to say that now he is a fine teacher of science in the public schools of the State of Pennsylvania, and I think he is located at Warren, Pa. He could not have made a living walking on his crippled foot as a policeman.

I make that statement to clarify the following statement which appears in the report at page 10:

College education for a young man who had lost 3 toes on his right foot, but who, despite his vocational handicap, became the eastern intercollegiate wrestling champion while being rehabilitated.

When I read this statement I set about to find out something about the case they were referring to. There was nothing in the hearings. But I did find the case arose in Pennsylvania. I then called the State director for the State of Pennsylvania, who looked up the records and gave me the information heretofore mentioned, and further stated that there was no just cause for criticism. That it was a good case, the man was doing fine, and had justified both the faith placed in him and the investment made.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to pay tribute to a very able person who administers vocational rehabilitation in my State. His name is Mr. H. L. Benshoof. He, himself, was rehabilitated, and he is very

grateful for all the help he received in order that he might live a useful life. As director of this activity in Iowa he has performed and is performing a most worthy service.

May I give you in just a sentence or two a report on the results in my State:

About 1,000 disabled men and women are rehabilitated into self-supporting employment every year in Iowa through the services of vocational rehabilitation. Our experience has consistently been that for every 1,000 persons rehabilitated there is an increase in cash earnings of \$2 million the very first year. This means more productive workers in industry, fewer disabled persons on relief rolls, and more wage earners who are paying taxes to the State government and to the Federal Government.

I testified before this subcommittee last year in behalf of vocational rehabilitation. I repeat my interest in it now. I earnestly hope that this service, which is working well and which is a vehicle for taking persons off welfare rolls and opening the door of opportunity to them to become self-supporting and taxpaying citizens, may be dealt with generously by the Congress. According to my information, the legislature of Iowa increased its appropriation for this service by 80 percent in the session recently concluded.

(Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I concur in everything that has been said as to the worthwhileness of this program. I know a great deal more about it myself than just what is learned through hearings with the top officials of the office, because I have worked with it in the city of Chicago. However, we are missing the main point in this debate.

I am constrained to say that the vote for restoration of the reductions the committee has made in this bill has been practically unanimous on the other side of the aisle. It was not that way 2 years ago, in 1951, when the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] was chairman of the committee. The budget request came to our committee for the same amount requested this year, \$23 million. The committee, under his chairmanship, cut it the same amount as we have this year, to \$20,600,000.

Now, why did the gentleman not vote to restore the cut 2 years ago, when he was chairman of the committee? But, no, it is when the Republicans are in control that you want to restore all of the cuts that are made in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make one more point regarding the investigators and their report. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] made mention of the fact that he did not get the report until the committee was ready to mark up the bill.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I did not make any such statement. We did not get it until it was printed before the main committee.



Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman got it just as soon as any member of the committee got it. These investigators, as a result of spot checking, found about 22 cases in the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation in which they thought exceptions should have been taken at the Federal level here at Washington, D. C. I concurred in their opinion on those 22 cases. I think this committee should see to it that this program, which basically is very worthwhile, is carried on at the Federal level, as it should be and as the Congress wants it to be carried on. I think there is gross maladministration at the Federal level in this program, and I think this is most unfortunate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I just want to say to my distinguished chairman that I do not agree with him at all on the investigators' report. Under leave to extend the remarks I have already made, I will insert instances of the three cases mentioned in the report, not the committee, and also one or two others where the report said no exceptions were made. But exceptions were made, and the record shows they were made.

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes, exceptions were made after the staff called some of these cases to their attention. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting information in the RECORD which will show what happened to the cases mentioned in their report. I think that information should be presented to the House.

(The information referred to follows:)

State: North Carolina.

Fiscal year 1946.

Amount paid: \$357.25.

Clients' names: Virginia Summers, Fred Cochrane, Ezekial Lamb, Inez Libersay.

Date audit report received in Washington: March 9, 1950.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: March 12, 1950.

Action taken: Cleared by region on contention of regional representative that this was not a fiscal question.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Dental treatment and dentures given to four clients who did not have substantial employment handicap and whose need had not been established.

State: Idaho.

Fiscal year: 1947, 1948.

Amount paid: \$139.66.

Client's name: E. T. Allen.

Date audit report received in Washington: November 10, 1949.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: November 17, 1949.

Action taken: Proposed exception deleted and reclassified as administrative information. The auditors had to accept the decision.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Medical services to power company employee with \$50 monthly life income, a car valued at \$700, a tractor valued at \$500, and property with a net assessed worth, after encumbrances, of \$5,000, and with no debts. These figures indicate that the client was not in need. Client was also earning \$60 weekly at a turbine operator. Received new limbs from power company. After rehabilitation, returned to work as turbine operator at \$60 weekly.

State: Idaho.

Fiscal year: 1948.

Amount paid: \$260.33.

Client's name: Norman D. Carothers.

Date audit report received in Washington: November 10, 1949.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: November 17, 1949.

Action taken: Regional auditor proposed exception. Office of Vocational Rehabilitation objected. Put in administrative section.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: College tuition and books for 22-year-old student for whom occupational handicap had not been determined who had a brother in college and whose mother was a retouch artist. Client was said to have been disabled from the age of 17 but subsequent to that time (probably not on a full-time basis) earned \$60 weekly as a teacher. Economic need not determined.

State: Idaho.

Fiscal year: 1948, 1949.

Amount paid: \$77.64.

Client's name: James L. Welch.

Date audit report received in Washington: November 10, 1949.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: November 17, 1949.

Action taken: Case put in administrative section.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Training and tuition for 19-year-old boy with a loss of 3 fingers of the right hand and part of the index finger on the left hand. Client was working regularly at time of application. Got \$1 per hour, was studying engineering, and also flying private plane. Client said he had \$450 in cash and that his parents were able to support him but he preferred self-support. Substantial vocational handicap not indicated and need not determined.

State: Idaho.

Fiscal year: 1948 and 1949.

Amount paid: No amount given.

Client's name: Marion B. Pierstoff.

Date audit report received in Washington: November 10, 1949.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: November 17, 1949.

Action taken: Deleted per request of Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and put in administrative section as administrative information.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Schooling of client without disability and without demonstrating economic need. State agency contended that client would be substantially handicapped if he lost his glasses while away from home.

State: North Carolina.

Fiscal year: 1948.

Amount paid: \$709.75.

Client's name: Wellington W. Daniels.

Date audit report received in Washington: Exception cleared in region. Never included in a report.

Date to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Same as above.

Action taken: Cleared in regional office on contention that it was not a fiscal exception. Auditors had to accept the decision.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Four small electric motors and other woodworking equipment purchased for amputee who was a woodworking shop worker at a salary of \$160 monthly. Case folder had no evidence that client met eligibility criteria.

State: Virginia.

Fiscal year: 1948.

Amount paid: \$225.

Client's name: Ariene Denicke.

Date question received in Washington: By memorandum dated July 12, 1949, for special decision.

Date question transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Draft reply to region sent to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation for clearance on July 28, 1949, telling region to take exception. Eventually so released to region.

Action taken: Cleared in region on contention of regional representative of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation that needs exceeded resources. Auditor without authority to take exception.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Medical care to housewife injured in auto accident who was already under treatment when taken as client. Rehabilitation objective, housewife. Husband employed by United States Government at salary of \$7,106 with unsubstantiated needs totaling \$9,875, including \$5,185 not detailed.

State: West Virginia.

Fiscal year 1948.

Amount paid: \$1,159.65.

Client's name: Robert Moxley.

Date audit report received in Washington: Not included in an audit report. Question of allowability submitted to Washington on June 27, 1950.

Date transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Question submitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation on June 27, 1950, for their recommendation.

Action taken: No further audit action taken. The case was dropped in the region upon advice of the decision made by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation on June 20, 1951. The auditors had to accept the decision.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Training and maintenance for tippie worker with spot on lung but without tuberculosis. Rehabilitated into a minister. Sanitarium examined client for 56 days without finding TB and medical examination, including X-ray, showed no TB. Apparently no vocational handicap.

State: West Virginia.

Fiscal year: 1948.

Amount paid: \$75.

Client's name: Levada Owens.

Date question received in Washington: June 27, 1949.

Date question transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Draft reply sent to OVR September 8, 1949.

Action taken: We eventually had to release an instruction to delete the exception upon recommendation of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation that a substantial handicap existed. Auditors do not have enough authority to oppose the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Teeth extraction and purchase of dentures for housewife referred by the Department of Public Assistance. No other rehabilitation service furnished.

State: West Virginia.

Fiscal year: 1948.

Amount paid: \$1,443.23.

Client's name: Luther Norris.

Date audit report received in Washington: August 7, 1952.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: August 8, 1952.

Action taken: Still waiting Office of Vocational Rehabilitation recommendation on State appeal from the exception.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Rehabilitating a minister (since 1943) into a minister. Disability consisted of squinting in both eyes and slight nervousness and examining physician recommended that client see an eye specialist. No record of eye specialist being consulted and no medical treatment was given this client.



State: District of Columbia.  
Fiscal year: 1950.  
Amount paid: \$2,228.  
Client's name: William E. Spencer.  
Date report received in Washington: August 21, 1950.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: December 28, 1950.

Action taken: The auditor commented in his administrative section on this case because of the question of whether there was a vocational handicap. No further action known of.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Schooling for 21-year-old who had been working for 2 years following 2-year commitment to St. Elizabeths. Client quit his job when accepted for rehabilitation. Doctor recommended that college training be given so that client would not have to take dual load of college study and full-time employment.

State: West Virginia.  
Fiscal year: 1949.  
Amount paid: \$37.  
Client's name: Harley L. Long.  
Date question received in Washington: June 27, 1950.

Date question transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Our draft reply sent to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation in July 1950.

Action taken: We eventually had to release an instruction to delete the exception upon recommendation of Office of Vocational Rehabilitation that a substantial handicap existed. Auditors do not have enough authority to oppose the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Medical care given to client referred by the Department of Public Assistance. No other rehabilitation service was rendered this client.

State: West Virginia.  
Fiscal year: 1949.  
Amount paid: \$20.  
Client's name: Doris J. Ramsey.  
Date audit report received in Washington: August 7, 1952.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: August 8, 1952.

Action taken: Action by Office of Vocational Rehabilitation still pending. No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Eyeglasses purchased for 20-year-old secretary to retain job as secretary and correct nearsightedness. Not an occupational handicap and client had monthly salary of \$110.

State: California.  
Fiscal year: 1950.  
Amount paid: No amount given.  
Client's name: Jay W. Butler.  
Date report received in Washington: March 6, 1951.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: July 27, 1951.

Action taken: This case was referred to the regional representative for his consideration during the administrative review. It was not on list of administrative review exceptions included in 1951 audit report so apparently no further action was taken.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Maintenance and tuition furnished to obese (317 pounds) college student after 2 years of college. Client's vocational objective was to become a teacher of mathematics. State suggested medical services to reduce weight, but declined. Case record indicated good possibility of school employment without anything being done to correct the so-called disability.

State: Georgia.  
Fiscal year: 1950.  
Amount paid: \$3,735.73.

Date audit report received in Washington: February 12, 1951.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: July 2, 1952.

Action taken: This material first came in as an administrative comment. We complained to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and on April 2, 1953, they recommended that the question be sent to the region to reopen and submit to the State for concurrence or appeal of the exception.

Type of item: Travel expenses of 27 members of Georgia staff attending conference in San Antonio, most of whom were approved as a reward for assistance in a fund-raising campaign for National Rehabilitation Association. This group included 5 secretary-stenographers and 13 counselors. Director of OVR has been handling for possible fiscal exception.

State: Illinois.  
Fiscal year: 1950.  
Amount paid: Total expenditures approximately \$8,000 per month.  
Clients' names: Numerous, not identified.  
Date audit report received in Washington: March 14, 1951.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: October 17, 1951.

Action taken: Handled as an administrative comment. Exception not taken because of lack of authority by audit division.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: A number of trainees sent to TB sanatoria at rates of \$20 to \$40 monthly to be trained in homemaking, though they were housewives.

State: Michigan (blind).  
Fiscal year: 1950.  
Amount paid: \$1,040.62.  
Clients' names: Peter Wierek, Arminda Tucker, Delia Des Armier.

Date audit report received in Washington: August 6, 1951.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: April 16, 1952.

Action taken: No fiscal action. This was an administrative comment to which the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation gave some consideration but no disallowance was made.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: \$438.92, Peter Wierek, cataract operation and hospitalization for 67-year-old client residing in county infirmary. To be rehabilitated in order to be returned to former work. After rehabilitation, client did not seek employment and caseworker commented this may have been due to life of leisure in infirmary; \$360, Delia Des Armier, cataract operation and hospitalization for 74-year-old housewife who received old-age assistance of \$450 and had been on old-age assistance for almost 8 years prior to the operation. File indicated client kept house for a crippled son but does not indicate result of rehabilitation upon public assistance; \$241.70, Arminda Tucker, cataract operation and hospitalization for 80-year-old housewife who had been on public-assistance rolls since December 1947, and during period of rehabilitation received \$468 from Public Assistance. Client was said to be keeping house for invalid relatives.

State: Michigan.  
Fiscal year: 1950.  
Amount paid: \$152.  
Client's name: Leah Partridge.

Date audit report received in Washington: October 17, 1951.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: October 24, 1951.

Action taken: Commented on in administrative section.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Medical treatment of facial skin infection of housewife who was on aid-to-dependent-children rolls. Medical con-

sultant commented that patient might pay for simple treatment of acne.

State: Pennsylvania.  
Fiscal year 1950.  
Amount paid: Treated as administrative comment; no amount given.

Client's name: Homer J. Barr.  
Date audit report received in Washington: April 3, 1951. Not handled as an exception but as an administrative comment.

Date to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: July 3, 1951.

Action taken: No fiscal action. This was an administrative comment to which the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation gave some consideration but no disallowance was made.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: College for client without 3 toes on right foot on which 2 examining doctors disagreed to a vocational handicap. Client became eastern intercollegiate wrestling champ during rehabilitation.

State: South Dakota (blind).  
Fiscal year: 1950.  
Amount paid: Treated as administrative comment; no amount given.

Client's name: Mrs. Darrell McLane.  
Date audit report received in Washington: July 27, 1951.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: October 12, 1951.

Action taken: Handled as an administrative comment. No action taken by auditor because of lack of authority.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Purchase of plastic eye for housewife whose husband's income was \$212 with no other dependents. OVR advised regional representative not to question eligibility stating that legal obligation of husband was "probably not such rehabilitation service as a plastic eye." Husband had refused to buy new eye. OVR also stated that where husband refuses rehabilitation service for wife, or parents refuse for child, even though family income appears adequate, family funds are considered not available to client.

State: South Dakota (blind).  
Fiscal year: 1950.  
Amount paid: \$265.45.  
Client's name: William Dennett.  
Date audit report received in Washington: July 27, 1951.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: October 12, 1951.

Action taken: No fiscal action because of lack of authority in Audit Division.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Eye operation for a 79-year-old recipient of old-age assistance who was not to become gainfully employed, service being given only to reduce the care at the convalescent home. After the operation, client continued to receive old-age assistance.

State: Pennsylvania (blind).  
Fiscal year: 1946, 1947, 1948.  
Amount paid: \$1,200.  
Client's name: Bruno J. Woiozyn.  
Date audit report received in Washington: August 30, 1949.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: September 9, 1949.

Action taken: State concurred.  
Exception taken and over expenditure recovered.

Type of item: In this case 3 pianos costing \$1,200 were purchased for a self-employed piano tuner and repairman with an income of over \$2,600 annually.

Mr. FOGARTY. I would think then the fair thing to do for you, as chairman of this committee, when you get a report like that, is to get the committee together immediately, call up the



people responsible, and let us get a report and not take it from someone who does not know anything about rehabilitation.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think that suggestion is a good one, but I did not get the report in time to do that. The investigators had to work nights in order to get the report to the committee before we marked up the bill. And, I will insist on one thing more: That the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation be thoroughly investigated before we even consider appropriations for the fiscal year 1955.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 78, noes 41.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (including the objects specified in the preceding paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

[Mr. FOGARTY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, just before the committee rose on Friday, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] offered an amendment restoring the land grant colleges appropriation under the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, which was unanimously adopted. I think he was very wise in doing that. I want the record to distinctly show, however, that we the minority members of the committee at all times protested the elimination of this item from the appropriation bill. I am glad that the chairman of the committee reconsidered the matter and that this appropriation is now in the bill.

However, coincident with the adoption of this amendment, our genial floor leader, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] undertook to give what he said was notice to the States that this appropriation will be discontinued in the future. Now, I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Indiana. He is one of the most cogent speakers in this House, and I love to hear him speak. He is an able member of the House, and he is an able floor leader. But for the life of me, I cannot understand under what authority he assumes to speak for the entire House and for the entire Congress. We have a law which has been on the statute books since 1935, and which as late as 1952 was given consideration by the legislative committee, and amended and extended but not repealed. If the gentleman from

Indiana wants to give notice to the States of a reversal of policy by this Republican Congress, the proper thing for him to do is to go before the appropriate committee, have a bill reported out repealing that law, and submit the matter to a vote. That would be the orderly and the proper procedure.

I personally am opposed to the repeal of that law, and I am certainly opposed to its repeal by indirection in an appropriation bill. I cannot go along with my good chairman on that point, and neither can I go along with some of the declarations made in the report of this bill. For example at page 11, with respect to appropriations for the venereal diseases, it is stated:

The committee believes that the point has been reached where the States and communities can take care of the problem with a minimum of assistance from the Federal Government.

As a member of the subcommittee, I disassociate myself entirely with any such view stated in the report.

Indeed I disassociate myself with a good many statements made in the report. I have already called attention to the statement made on page 4, with respect to the Mexican farm-labor program, where it is stated:

The committee has serious misgivings about this program, which guarantees to foreign agricultural workers coming into this country many things such as medical care for sickness or injury incurred on the job, minimum wages, adequate living quarters, etc., which are guaranteed to our own citizens.

Those may be the views of the chairman or the majority members of the committee, but they certainly do not reflect the views of this one member of that subcommittee.

Again at page 6 of the report dealing with publications of the Office of Education, it is stated:

Assuming education is the science of teaching truthfully, factually, and, above everything else, objectively, one cannot help questioning the manner in which the publications regarding the United Nations have been handled.

And further down the report states:

It is an indictment of the former Commissioner of Education that he would permit the Office to propagandize one side of a question as controversial as the United Nations, completely excluding the other side.

Mr. Chairman, these reports are prepared by the staff under the direction of the chairman, and these statements may represent the views of the chairman, but I submit that there is not one iota of evidence to justify any such severe indictment and criticism. Yes, there were statements by the chairman in which he assumed what the report says, but he did not present or point to any facts to justify his assumption, and no witness gave testimony justifying any such assumption to sustain the statement in the report.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. If the gentleman will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the other day when the gentleman from

North Carolina asked me to include certain tabulations along with the hearings, he will see what I meant by that because I included it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Of course, if this report is just the opinion of the chairman, that is a different proposition. What I am complaining about is this—

Mr. BUSBEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

What I am complaining about is that some of these indictments and statements of views that are put into these reports were not submitted to the other members of the subcommittee. Yet they come up here as if they were reported by the entire committee.

Mr. BUSBEY. Was the report submitted to the committee when the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] was chairman of the committee last year?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I was not a member of the committee under him, but I never saw this kind of broadside indictment in any of his reports. A committee should not be placed in the position of making unjustified indictments of this sort, without ever discussing them with the members. What is wrong with extending them that right and that courtesy? I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, during general debate on this bill I brought to the attention of the Members a letter from Dr. John D. Porterfield director of health of the State of Ohio. His letter appears on page 5528 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 21, 1953. I would like to read again Dr. Porterfield's letter:

STATE OF OHIO,  
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
Columbus, Ohio, March 12, 1953.

Mrs. KATHALEEN C. ARNESON,  
Washington Representative, Spokesmen  
for Children, Arlington, Va.

DEAR MRS. ARNESON: I am in receipt of your letter of February 27, which is concerned with the impending reduction in Federal grants-in-aid to the States as indicated in the President's budget.

Ohio's share of maternal and child-health grant-in-aid funds is not sufficient to carry on the scope and quality of program we would like to see realized. Our State legislature has never appropriated funds to support the maternal and child-health program, and thus we rely entirely on Federal assistance.

In the main there are two broad categories which would be affected by a reduction in Federal funds, namely: (1) Less money for distribution to local health departments throughout the State; and (2) a reduction in consultative and demonstration services. This means that local health departments will have less financial assistance from the State to supplement their undernourished budgets. Of necessity such activities, as well as child conferences, immunization programs, school health, otologi-



cal diagnostic clinics, etc., would have to function on a lesser scale. From the standpoint of the State health department, an expansion of the nutrition, hearing, and vision programs would not be possible and the addition of such vital persons as a pediatrician and more hospital nursing consultants to the maternal and child-health staff would be out of the question. I need not dwell on what benefits would be derived from the addition of such key staff to the State as a whole.

If sufficient grant-in-aid moneys were received, this department would be in a position to not only supplement the present staff but to provide sums of money for payments to hospitals for care of premature infants of medically indigent parents and also make payments for medical and surgical care for needy children who had been examined at our State-sponsored otological diagnostic clinics.

I realize this is a rather sketchy presentation of some of the needs which could be met if additional Federal funds were available. I sincerely hope this information will be useful to you.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. PORTERFIELD, M. D.

I was shocked and surprised by the statement that the State of Ohio—my State—which is debt-free and has a large surplus in its treasury, was failing to meet its responsibilities to the children of the State—child care, crippled children, and maternal welfare. The demand for increased Federal funds from Ohio did not, in my opinion, come with good grace. I called upon the State to meet its responsibilities, as it has the ability to do.

Dr. Porterfield, in his statement, I repeat, said:

Ohio's share of maternal and child-health grant-in-aid funds is not sufficient to carry on the scope and quality of program we would like to see realized. Our State legislature has never appropriated funds to support the maternal and child-health program, and thus we rely entirely on Federal assistance.

Imagine my surprise—yes; my chagrin—when I found that Dr. Porterfield had not presented the true facts in his letter. I asked the Chief of the Children's Bureau, SSA, to give me the facts—the figures—of what Ohio had appropriated and what they had paid in matching funds from Ohio. I shall read that report to you.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU, SSA,  
May 22, 1953.

To: Congressman FRANK T. BOW.

From: Martha M. Elliot, M. D., Chief.

Subject: State and local funds for matching Federal grants for maternal and child health, and crippled children's services, Ohio.

In accordance with your telephone request, I am submitting below figures showing the amount of State, local, and Federal funds for Ohio's maternal and child health, and crippled children's programs during the fiscal year 1953. Title V of the Social Security Act requires that each State match a substantial part of the Federal grants for these two programs.

Maternal and child health program:

Total State and local funds-----	\$266,700
State-----	26,000
Local-----	240,700
Total Federal funds-----	449,012
To be matched-----	258,238
Unmatched-----	190,774

Crippled children's program:

Total State and local funds-----	\$944,885
State-----	358,944
Local-----	585,941
Total Federal funds-----	414,636
To be matched-----	225,111
Unmatched-----	189,525

Total for both programs:

State and local funds for matching-----	1,211,585
State funds-----	384,944
Local funds-----	826,641
Federal funds-----	863,648
To be matched-----	483,349
Unmatched-----	380,299

Ohio is, therefore, putting up a considerable amount more for the maternal and child health, and the crippled children's programs than the funds allotted to the State from Federal appropriations for these two programs.

For its total public health program, Ohio reports amounts put up by the State and local authorities for the fiscal year 1953, as follows:

State-----	\$2,367,751
Local-----	7,007,497
Total-----	9,375,248

In accordance with your request, I am enclosing an additional copy of this memorandum for you to give to Congressman BOLTON.

MARTHA M. ELIOT, M. D.

So you see, Mr. Chairman, Governor Lausche's director of public health either is ignorant of the facts he should know or he has deliberately attempted to mislead the Congress and the people of the country.

Whichever may be the fact, Governor Lausche and Dr. Porterfield must accept full responsibility for a very confused situation which exists in Ohio today.

If the Governor had no knowledge of the act of his director of public health, he should remove him at once. As I say, he is guilty of either inexcusable ignorance, or of gross misrepresentation of material facts.

I believe it to be important to bring further facts to the attention of Members. The same Dr. Porterfield who said no funds are appropriated prepared a budget for the present legislature. His budget called for an appropriation of \$2,348,000 for the first year and \$2,400,000 for the second year.

Governor Lausche, through his director of finance, reduced this amount to \$1,354,000 for the first year and \$1,382,000 for the second year. The Governor of the great State of Ohio, Frank Lausche, has reduced the budget for health in the State \$1,000,000 a year for the next two years.

This State, with no debt and a large surplus, called upon the Federal Treasury for larger contributions. No wonder we have a debt of \$267,000,000,000. If we are to balance the budget; if we are to give much-needed tax relief to the American people; States must accept their rightful obligations. Can this action by the Governor of Ohio and his State health director to be an admission by them that they are not competent to handle the health problem of the State?

If the health programs of Ohio suffer during the next 2 years it will be the direct responsibility of Governor Lausche, for he, and he alone, through his director of finance, took from the State budget \$2,000,000 for health programs.

I resent, and I am sure the people of Ohio will resent, the misleading statement by Governor Lausche's director of health, in the letter I referred to. He should be removed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including not to exceed \$3,000 for production, purchase, and distribution of educational films; \$500,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 16, line 15, strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$690,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment goes along with the previous amendment that was just adopted on the grants to States for vocational rehabilitation.

I think Dr. Judd brought out the fact very well when he said in his closing remarks that when this budget went before the new administration, the Eisenhower administration, they did not cut grants to States by 1 dime. That was the one agency of Government that they said should not be cut. It is the one agency in Government that the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare said should not be cut. It is one of the most important of all Government agencies today. But on "Salaries and expenses," the Eisenhower budget did make a reduction from \$700,000 down to \$690,000. All I am trying to do is to restore the committee action to the Eisenhower budget, to carry on the administration of this program. The bill includes today \$500,000, which is a reduction of \$225,000 from the request, and \$200,000 below what you gave them in fiscal 1953. The committee report also says that none of this reduction should be applied against the approval of State plans and grants.

Let me tell you what this reduction of \$190,000 below the Eisenhower budget will do. It means a cut of 37 positions out of 98.

This is a 38-percent reduction in personnel. How in the world are you going to appropriate \$23 million for grants and then complain about the administration of this program. You cut their administration in half and expect them to do a half decent job?

If this action of the committee is allowed to stand it means one of two things: Either wipe out the entire regional staff—and no one in the Congress or elsewhere has even suggested this; or divide the reduction between regional and headquarters staffs. After making allowance for legal requirements incident to granting of funds, and for Federal operating expenses, this would require first the elimination of 7 of the 10 regional offices; and, second, the virtual



elimination of such functions as services for the blind, hard of hearing, medical rehabilitation, statistical reporting, and public information.

This reduced staff could not even do what is now done in reviewing State programs to safeguard the spending of Federal funds invested in this program. If funds for grants to State are cut, it becomes more important than ever to insure that every Federal dollar is spent as efficiently as possible.

It is the most foolish thing in the world to come in here and complain about the administration of this program by saying that it is not being administered properly and then cut them 38 percent and take away services for the blind, the hard of hearing, and so forth.

All my amendment does, Mr. Chairman, is to restore the item to the figure recommended in the Eisenhower budget for salaries and expenses of the vocational rehabilitation program.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment should be defeated. The major part of this cut will be in the activity, "Development of rehabilitation services for the handicapped." This should be primarily a State function, with some coordination and advice from the Federal Government. The amount in the bill would provide about \$300,000 for this purpose, even if no reduction were made in the office's other activities. If the office were run efficiently, it could operate on much less.

This cut will not hurt the program at all.

I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUSBEY) there were—ayes 63, noes 50.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. BUSBEY and Mr. FOGARTY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 82, noes 80.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out those provisions of sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of the act relating to sanitation and other aspects of environmental health, including enforcement of applicable quarantine laws and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carrying out the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466-466 (j)); \$3,000,000.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How about the motion I have at the desk? Is that not a preferential motion?

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman from California suspend until the motion offered by the gentleman from

Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is reported by the Clerk?

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: That the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it be referred to the Committee with instructions to increase each item in the bill by 10 percent.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to be quite evident that our friends on my right are determined to prevent the adoption of this bill as written. They seem determined to add to it and to each item in it something, so I make this motion in order to save the time of the House, not that I will vote for the motion, because I will not, if it is permitted to go to a vote.

Why my colleagues should write their constituents and advocate publicly that they want to balance the budget—and this is not in the form of a lecture; it is just in sort of an inquiring mood that I happen to be in to see if I can get a little information that will help me to straighten out my course—why my colleagues should write their constituents, if they do write their constituents, that we should balance the budget and reduce taxes, and then increase every appropriation bill which renders that intense desire on their part to be impossible of accomplishment, I cannot understand.

And I will be happy, indeed, and extremely grateful if they will take me aside, because explanations here might be embarrassing—if they will take me aside in the lobby or call me to come to their offices, and give an explanation of how we can reconcile our promises and the promise of the administration with our conduct on the floor.

Now, I do not criticize; of course, I never criticize anyone. I do not question the attitude of our Democratic New Deal-Fair Deal friends. They have existed for a long, long time on this old program of Harry Hopkins to tax and spend and get the votes. And, that is all right for them, but I do not know why we, as Republicans, should go along with that program. I cannot figure it out, and, if somewhere I have missed something, I hope that they will enlighten me.

I have tried—I will not say I have prayed over it, but I have thought about it, and in the nighttime I have awakened and it has worried me and it has bothered me, so it seems to me that now, with a shortcut like this, just send it back, if that is the sense of the House, and say, "All right boys, go ahead, increase it."

With the other duties I have, I cannot understand all these questions, and when we have a Committee on Appropriations as we have, with a staff as large as it is and as competent as it is, I do not feel that I can come along and vote in opposition to their recommendations after all the study they have given to it.

I know that, for example, on this aid-to-vocational-education program, I have

had a lot of wires and letters, and some folks have come in to see me personally, friends of mine, 1 or 2 of them, who contributed very generously to my primary and general election campaigns, and I would like to go along with those folks if I could; and I could, perhaps, if I just followed my own inclinations.

But the good wife every once in a while catches up with me and she says, "Now, listen. You said so and so. How come you voted that way?" I cannot keep her from reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I wish I could, but I cannot do it. That is why I offered this motion. I shall vote against the motion if it is submitted.

Nevertheless, I would like an expression of the House because, if you are going to repudiate our good colleague from New York and his assistants on the committee who worked so hard and so long and who so thoroughly go into these questions, just because somebody in the district wants us to vote for this particular thing or someone makes an emotional plea, if that is the case, let us go ahead and get rid of it. Then we can do something else the rest of the week.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. Chairman, I certainly cannot overlook this opportunity to oppose such a motion as the one now pending before the Committee, to increase every single item in this huge appropriation bill by 10 percent. There are some items in this bill which should be increased more than 10 percent. But the pending method of approach to economy is just as senseless as it is to slash an appropriation bill by 10 percent in meat-ax fashion, and I have said this for many years.

I must say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that if his party, which is in control of the House, which is the majority party, and the Republican Senate and administration want to balance the budget, they have the votes and the prerogative to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California: On page 18, line 8, strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$3,793,800."

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase funds for the item of engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene. I looked at the report on this item and find that it merely says that a certain amount of money has been stricken from the bill, and then the Committee feels there should be certain consolidation of activities at a laboratory that is just being opened in Cincinnati.

What is this item? This is the item by which the Public Health Service conducts its field investigations in wa-



ter pollution, including industrial pollutions caused in streams, in sewage disposal, and the way to take care of sewage disposal and of chemical waste. There is not an industrial community in this country that is not concerned with chemical and industrial waste, which are the bane of our citizens. It takes care of air pollution. We remember what took place at Donara, Pa., some time ago, and what air pollution means in such a place as Los Angeles and other great industrial cities. This is the place where that work is carried on and what are you doing? You are cutting this appropriation by substantially 25 percent with no justification. It means you are going to lose a lot of trained personnel—engineers, chemists, and so forth—in a field that is extremely necessary. We are living at a high tempo. We have to find some way to take care of these wastes created by the industrialization of our country. With the populations of certain communities growing as rapidly as they are, sewage disposal presents a great problem and the neutralization of that is important. That is the type of research work that is done at this laboratory. For over the 4 or 5 years we have been in the process of building and creating a laboratory in Cincinnati. Then what do we do? We are making a meat-ax cut on the money to operate that laboratory. We are going way below the Eisenhower budget. I submit to you that in this day and age, if there is one thing we have to do, and one place we have to start, it is the study of pollution for both water and air, and the control of such diseases that comes from such pollutions. It is under this item that the work of developing a universal standardization of milk, a desirable end, will be brought about. I ask you to think this over carefully. This has no great lobby behind it and pressing for its adoption. There are a few engineers in the House of Representatives, a few Members who understand this situation, but give it some thought and see if you want this item drastically reduced and to cut off a vitally necessary field of investigation.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the States, the communities, and private industry are paying more attention to this type of research than they have in the past, and that is the way it should be. We have been talking about this great bureaucracy that has been built up in Washington over the past 20 years, with tremendous centralization of government. In nearly every one of these appropriation bills, there is an opportunity to get more authority and responsibility to the States, where it belongs. Private industry is doing a great deal in this respect and can do a lot more.

In addition, the Public Health Service has two buildings at Cincinnati where this activity is carried on. This work could be done more efficiently and with less money if it were consolidated in one building. I think the cut recommended by the committee is reasonable and moderate, and the amendment of the

gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] should be defeated.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: On page 18, line 8, strike out the figure "\$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,850,000."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I speak for the substitute which I offer to the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], which increases the appropriation by \$850,000 to conform to the Eisenhower budget estimate. I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, by district stretches for 300 miles along the Ohio River—La Belle Riviere, or the Beautiful River, as the French called it. I have more river in my district than does any other Member of this House.

And I suspect I have more water pollution flowing past my district than does any other Member of this House. It is a doubtful distinction.

The French explorers knew what they were talking about when they called the Ohio beautiful. So did the early settlers who floated their flatboats down from Pittsburgh 170 years ago.

The wooded hills looked down on a clear river. The best of fish swam in its clean waters. In the autumn the ducks flying south happily dropped down to rest and feed on the Ohio. A settler drifting down the river could drop a bucket over the side, dip up water, and drink without fear of an immediate attack of gastroenteritis.

People seldom talk now of the beautiful Ohio. Why?

Because man has converted the Ohio into an open sewer. The river has been locked and dammed for the purpose of obtaining a 9-foot stage of water. The river consists of a series of pools which in the summertime become stagnant and foul. There is such a pool extending from Fernbank to Coney Island, a distance of about 12 miles, and into that pool goes the waste of this great industrial region, sometimes called the Ruhr of America, and the domestic sewage of almost 1 million people.

Only the poorest of fish linger in its waters. Ducks hardly dare light there no matter how weary. Man must spend millions of dollars in water-treatment plants before he dare drink its water. Even then, he must steel himself against the awful taste of phenol before he can swallow, and sometimes the chemists at the treatment plants tremble as they peer into their microscopes after all their treatment efforts. There is little wonder that the sale of bottled water is a flourishing industry up and down the valley of this beautiful Ohio.

The truth is that we have increased the pollution of the Ohio for every year that the white man has lived along its banks. It is, indeed, almost a monument in man's desecration of a natural resource.

This increase has continued despite the great Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 which the Ohio Valley so warmly advocated and which was based on bills

proposed by Mr. Elston, Mr. Mundt, of South Dakota, and myself in the House and Senator Taft and Senator Barkley in the Senate. That act has done much. But the best it could do was to retard the rate of increase in pollution of American rivers.

One major explanation lies in the boom in the chemical industry. Up and down our river, and others throughout the country, new chemical plants are springing up everywhere. They discharge new loads of chemical waste into the rivers—often waste from which there is no known treatment.

Another reason is the boom of the cities. They are struggling manfully to master the treatment of their sewage but their populations have been growing rapidly, critical materials have been in short supply, and tax money that might have gone to this purpose has been needed for defense. The result is a slow loss of ground in our fight against filth in rivers.

We come now to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would have the House notice that I do not ask it to restore the item of \$900,000 for grants to the States for research in water pollution. However, I must mention the irony of its omission from the appropriation this year.

These grants were authorized in the 1948 act just mentioned. The last appropriation was made 2 years ago. Last year a marvelous thing happened. A young scientist, working over at Johns Hopkins University under one of those grants—a grant of only \$6,500 mind you—discovered what appears to be a means of preventing the formation of sulfuric acid in coal mines.

That may mean nothing to many of you. To those who come from coal or river districts, it means a great deal. It means that the greatest single industrial pollutant of American rivers may be near an end. It means that the mining industry and others who use the rivers may save each year several times the \$2,900,000 that this House has voted since 1948 for these research grants.

Perfection of the mine acid process would have gotten \$50,000 to add to its \$6,500 if the program had been continued this year, but it was killed when the new people took over the department. I do not ask that it be restored. I simply mention the irony of killing the goose who has just laid its greatest golden egg.

I do ask this House, however, to restore to the item "Engineering, sanitation and industrial hygiene." We find on page 11 of the Appropriations Committee report that the committee has recommended \$3 million, a reduction of \$985,000 from the amount requested by the Public Health Service for this item, or \$850,000 below the revised budget.

These funds are used by the Public Health Service for its research, technical and field investigations for water pollution control and public water supplies, and for other engineering and sanitation work to keep under control the spread of communicable disease between the States. The amount recommended



by the committee will drastically reduce the Public Health Service's important water-pollution-control work, including research and field investigations. It will require a reduction of 75 percent in its technical field staff.

In 1948 my State of Kentucky and seven other States in the Ohio Valley entered into a compact to take the necessary action to clean up the river. An idea of the problem facing us is revealed by a survey which 6 of the States undertook in 1950 of the foul conditions caused by human and industrial wastes. At only 3 of the 27 sampling stations along a stretch of almost a thousand miles was the bacterial quality within the range recommended by the Public Health Service as being considered acceptable for public water supply purposes. We need the Public Health Service as an ally to the States in helping us to protect the water supply that the people in my district depend upon for their very lives.

With a relatively small sum of money, the Public Health Service since 1950 has been able to carry on research on a few of the more important water pollution problems, and with the States, industries, and municipalities, has been able to get well under way the development of pollution abatement plans to be placed into effect by the States. For many decades now the problems of interstate pollution have been a major drawback to action on the part of the States. The Public Health Service has provided a means through which the States can work together to solve these interstate problems.

The reduction recommended by the Appropriations Committee is drastic, far greater than that recommended by the President and Secretary Hobby. It will curtail seriously the very excellent work that the Public Health Service is doing on the water pollution problem. Water pollution is not growing less. It is constantly rising because of our greater industrialization and increasing population. A major reduction in the small, highly skilled professional staff which the Public Health Service will be required to make is a serious blow to the public health protection which is so essential to the people of my district and to more than half the population of our Nation who depend on our rivers and lakes for their drinking water.

In addition, there is just being completed at Cincinnati a new water pollution control research building, at a cost of \$4 million. We on the Ohio River have been looking forward to this building for a long time, with the expectation that the research undertaken there would yield a great deal of the knowledge which would help us to more effectively and at less cost combat the serious problem of water pollution. The reduced funds will limit markedly the amount and kind of research that the Public Health Service can do in this fine building.

Let us think what we do. Against a problem that grows more dangerous every day, we cut back our defenses.

Never was there greater need of work on how to eliminate water pollution.

New chemical wastes pour into the streams. New detergents are going into every housewife's washing machine and later into our rivers. American cities are facing a bill of between \$12 billion and \$15 billion for the sewage treatment plants that they must build. The thing that slows their program is the cost. But now the program which seeks a means of cutting that cost—a program that possibly might produce some great windfall like the mine-acid discovery made through the late program of grants—now the program that seeks to find a way to reduce those costs is itself to be cut back.

I sympathize with the efforts of the new administration and of the House committee to reduce appropriations, but in this case I must urge the House to make no more cut in this item than President Eisenhower did.

Our men battling the scourge of water pollution were losing ground with the program we had this year. Surely we should not withdraw their support and reduce their number at such a time. I urge the House to allow the \$3,850,000 which the Budget Bureau recommended for this item.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to compliment my distinguished colleague, the dean of the Kentucky delegation, on the statement he has made here today.

Since I came to Congress a few years ago I have observed that the gentleman has always actively supported legislation to eliminate pollution of our streams, and has been a constructive leader in that field. I will support the amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. When I was working for the correction of stream pollution I was working for my own salvation, I think.

There is not a dollar in here of appropriations for the States; all this is for the Government experts who lead this fight, who coordinate the efforts, advise the States; the States must furnish the money, the States must work together to formulate a plan that will ultimately result in cleaning up this river—and it is not only for this river but there are also lots of other rivers in the Nation. The reason I speak of this river is because I see it every day. There are lots of other rivers that need it just as much as the Ohio River.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, no one can disagree with the remarks made by the gentleman from Kentucky; certainly, if we can do something this year or in succeeding years to clean up the rivers of the Nation which have been polluted, those things should—and I am satisfied will—be done. But today we are faced with a problem of defending the very Nation. The only way that we can secure funds for the defense of this country and for balancing the budget is to cut out some of the things, certainly not to increase them over the past fiscal year.

I wonder if the Members of the House realize just what we are doing on this bill. On each item as we go down through the list if the Eisenhower budget is over the 1953 appropriation, the House is increasing to the revised budget. If the budget happens to be below the 1953 appropriation, the House increases to the 1953 level. I certainly fail to see how we can, in good conscience, tell our people back home that we are down here trying to correct the financial condition in which this country finds itself when all we are doing is jumping between the two figures we are offered; and the House in each instance is accepting the higher figure. If this action continues throughout this bill, there is but one result: Substantially higher spending at the end of 1953.

If we have any confidence in the new people who have taken over this administration, certainly we must give them credit that they will be able to make token reductions down the line; and if we give them more money than they ask for, if the 1953 figures happen to be more money and then keep up all of the figures to whatever might be asked for in the revised budget, this Congress in this bill must of necessity appropriate more money for these activities than was appropriated in fiscal 1953. If that is the record the House wishes to take back to their constituents, it is one to which I cannot subscribe.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPENCE) there were—ayes 35, noes 56.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BUSBEY and Mr. MILLER of California.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 49, noes 99.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hospital construction under part C, title VI, of the act, as amended, to remain available until expended, \$50 million: *Provided*, That allotments under such part C to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of an amount equal to the appropriation granted herein.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 18, line 24, strike out "\$50 million" and insert "\$75 million."

(Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I think that this is one of the most important amendments that we have to consider in this or any other appropriation bill. This phase of the appropriation bill affects every State in the Union. This bill is the so-called Hill-Burton



hospital construction bill that was passed on a nonpartisan basis. Senator HILL and former Senator Burton of Ohio were the original cosponsors of this bill in 1945. At that time it was a 5-year program authorizing the expenditure of \$75 million a year. In 1949 the bill was amended to run another 5 years, and under the law at the present time it expires in 1955. This year in the Senate, Senator TAFT of Ohio and Senator HILL of Alabama have introduced another extension of 5 years which would make the bill active until 1960. On the House side our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has introduced the same amendment as was introduced in the Senate to extend this act until 1960.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the sponsor of the act.

Mr. HARRIS. Since the gentleman referred to the two bills that have been introduced on this side and on the Senate side, I think it would be interesting to know that the present administration, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has recommended strongly an extension of 2 years of the act.

Mr. FOGARTY. When this bill was extended for this second period of 5 years 2 years ago it not only called for an authorization of \$75 million but without a dissenting vote in either House, either in the Senate or the House of Representatives, we extended that act for another 5 years and authorized the expenditure of \$150 million because it was on a nonpartisan basis. We appropriated \$150 million that year. The next year, because of a division in the full Committee on Appropriations, it was cut to \$75 million over my objection. The next year I think we appropriated \$82,500,000, and last year we appropriated \$75 million. This year the Truman budget called for \$75 million, because we have now been operating on a program for 8 years that has practically guaranteed to the States that there would be at least \$75 million made available every year for hospital construction in every State in the Union. Now the committee comes in and cuts it by 33 percent, a law that was passed by both Houses without a dissenting vote. I wonder at times if that is not legislation on an appropriation bill. I have said this before and I will keep on saying it as long as I possibly can, that when the Congress unanimously authorizes the expenditure of a certain amount of money for various programs the Committee on Appropriations is almost obligated to appropriate that money unless we can find something in the operations performed by that agency that will justify our cutting the budget. But I wish you could take a look at the hearings, and we had lengthy hearings on the appropriation for the Hill-Burton Act. There is not one word in the hearings before you today that justifies a cut of \$1 million, never mind \$25 million. Read through it, if you have a chance. There was not one word of testimony that was developed by our subcommittee or the full committee that justifies a cut such

as we are giving here at the present time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. What is the position of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on this amount? Has she asked for \$75 million or has she asked for \$50 million, or has she asked for neither?

Mr. FOGARTY. The position, I believe, of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare justified an appropriation of \$60 million, which was the revised budget figure or the Eisenhower budget figure. I must say this also. I am not sure how that figure was arrived at, because I know that the Office of the Secretary went before the Bureau of the Budget, I think on three occasions. The first time they went with their budget, the Bureau of the Budget said, "No. Go back and take out some more." This they did and went back again and the Bureau of the Budget said, "No. Go back and take out some more." They went back a third time, and on what items they were giving and taking at that time I do not know. It was not disclosed in the hearings.

As far as the justification of the Bureau of the Budget in cutting the figure to \$60 million is concerned, we have nothing in the hearings to justify that cut at all, nothing whatsoever in the hearings. The States, I believe, were given not only a promise but almost an obligation on our part that they would get at least \$75 million. I know 3 or 4 years ago when we authorized \$150 million we gave it to them 1 year. I know that since then there were inquiries from the States and arguments of Members coming upon the floor asking about this project or that project in their districts that could not get the amount, because we had not allowed the full authorization of \$150 million.

The same thing holds true today. There is not a State in the Union this will not affect, if we permit this to hold.

The chairman of my committee made a statement the other day, as I remember, that he did not know much about Dr. Cronin. I have known Dr. Cronin since he has been in charge of this program. I do not believe there is a man in this country any more capable of carrying out his responsibilities and duties under the law as we have prescribed for him than Dr. Cronin.

My Chairman said that perhaps an engineer or someone in that category should be at the head of this program. But, when this bill was discussed in 1945 and 1946, the issue was thrashed out then and there. This was not a brick and mortar problem. It was not a question of getting brick and mortar together and putting up four walls and a roof and a foundation. The principle then as advocated by the American Hospital Association and others who have endorsed this program was that it was more than a brick and mortar program, and that the programing of these hospitals should be done under some medical advice because they were the ones who

knew more about it than the engineers, but at the same time he has engineers at his disposal. He has architects at his disposal. The American Institute of Architects have endorsed this procedure, and his head architect here in Washington just received the highest award that an architect can receive in our country just a few weeks ago. He was the man who was responsible for the drawing of the plans and specifications, after the advice of the American Hospital Association, because it is a hospital association which knows how big the rooms should be, and how wide the doors should be, and what type of windows there should be in a hospital of this kind. It has been that kind of working agreement under which this program has worked out.

There has been another charge made that it costs in some cases \$50,000 a bed to build. Look at the hearings. The charge was made on the floor only the other day again that it cost \$50,000 a bed. That was gone into very thoroughly by the chairman of our committee, and you will find it starting on page 864 of the hearings where the charge was made. If you take the time to read the next 5 or 6 pages, you will find that that charge was absolutely not true. It was not for building a hospital or the cost of hospital beds at all. There was a project nearby where a State was building a nursing home and remodeling an existing hospital at the same time. Anyone who knows a thing about construction knows that it costs more to remodel than it does to build a new building.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think, if you will look at these hearings, you will find no justification for that charge at all.

Mr. Chairman, there have been other charges made of this report about unobligated funds. This talk about unobligated funds does not mean a thing. I remember the argument was used just a short time ago when we voted to give \$6 million to the school districts in the federally impacted areas where the charge was made that only some \$8 million have been obligated. I think everyone knows, if they know the law at all, that these funds are not given to the school districts because they have to wait until the end of the school year in June, and then they are paid on the basis of the attendance of pupils. Sometimes the funds are not paid out until as late as September after we have passed the fiscal year that we are working in. The same thing holds true in the hospital construction program as far as unobligated funds are concerned. One of the complaints was that over \$61 million of previously appropriated funds were unobligated as of February 28, 1953. But the committee, or whoever wrote the report, overlooked several factors. These



funds have already been allotted to the States and were made available by the Congress for a 2-year period. That is in the law. Over \$30 million of the \$61 million balance had on that date been allocated to project sponsors against which they were proceeding with fund raising. In fact, as of March 31, 1953, out of the \$82,500,000 appropriated for 1952, \$80,267,000 was already allocated to project sponsors.

Those are the facts and they are the only facts.

Another charge was made by the committee that many of the hospitals have been built and staffed, but used only a small percent of their capacity. I have taken that up with the American Hospital Association. I do not know who else I could go to or who would know more about it in the Federal agencies downtown.

Is there an organization in this country that knows more about this problem of hospitals than they do? Is there a Member of Congress who will make the claim that he knows more about this program than the American Hospital Association? I do not think they will get up and say that they do. The American Hospital Association has just completed a survey of this program, and they endorse it 100 percent. I checked with them just the other day, and they said this charge made by the committee was meaningless, because a majority of these hospitals have been built in rural areas. That was the main purpose of the bill when it was enacted, to take care of the rural areas, and as a result that has happened.

I remember 3 or 4 years ago, when there was some talk about socialized medicine, everyone who was against socialized medicine at that time said this was a good answer to socialized medicine. You will recall that some time ago there were complaints about a shortage of doctors in the rural areas of the country. This program has proven the point that we made then, that if we built these hospitals in the rural areas the doctors will come to them, and that has turned out 100 percent to be correct.

Another charge has been made that we are taking nurses away from some hospitals. There was something in the hearings about a certain percentage. Dr. Cronin did not know what the percentage was, but he did say that this program has brought back to active service many nurses who had retired; that 21 percent of the nurses working in these hospitals had come out of retirement, and as a result we have had much better medical care.

Another charge has been made that they are closing some of these hospitals. What does that mean? It does not amount to anything. Out of 1,150 projects that have been built so far—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BUSBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has been very liberal and we have

extended his time twice. There are many people who want to speak on this bill. I want a little extra time myself. I have not asked for any extra time myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to have the gentleman be a little reasonable on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, in the 13 years I have been here, I have never objected to a fellow Member on a subcommittee with me, or on the full committee, having an extension of time at all.

Mr. BUSBEY. The RECORD will show that I did not object.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am strongly supporting the gentleman's amendment, and I would like to ask him this question: The amount proposed in the gentleman's amendment is only one-half of the amount authorized by law under the Hill-Burton Act?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is absolutely correct.

There have been certain charges made that certain projects in the country have been built and will be closed. I have gone to the trouble to look into this, and many of the charges made in the report are absolutely untrue. The charge is made that some of these hospitals have not been able to operate. Only 3 out of the one-thousand-one-hundred-odd were not able to operate. One of them was on account of a grant. There was a grant made of about \$18,000 on equipment. The Federal Government is in the process of recouping that \$18,000. The other two were small projects in the Middle West or the near South, and because of circumstances not under their control, where an elderly doctor died and a new doctor moved out, they expect to have that hospital operating again in a few weeks. When they make the charge that these hospitals are closing, there are only 3, and 2 of those 3 will be opened in the next 2 months. That is the kind of charge we have had against this bill. This is one of the best bills ever presented to this Congress. It was enacted with nonpartisan support; it affects every State in the Union, not only the States but the local communities and other groups as well, as long as they raise the funds necessary to match the Federal grants. If there ever was an important amendment offered, it is this one on this bill today.

There is not a single State in our Nation which has not derived great benefit from this program of hospital and related health facility construction. Each of us in this House has or will at some time or other require the services of a physician, nurse, or other member of a hospital or health department staff. It is inevitable. It is something we

cannot and must not just toss off and forget about. I know you all feel just like I do. When I am ill or my loved ones are ill I will demand the best I can find. I have, I do, and I will. You have, you do, and you will.

As the former chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Labor-Federal Security Agency group I became particularly interested in the hospital survey and construction—Hill-Burton—program. I became aware of the great inadequacy of our Nation's total hospital plant to cope with needs of our people for hospital care. I realized the role of our hospitals in the training of young physicians, nurses, and other health personnel. I learned to appreciate the place of our hospitals in helping your physician and mine keep abreast of the many great advances all of us have seen in the field of medical science. Fellow Representatives, I assure you that without adequate hospital services no physician and his teammates in the medical and related fields can properly carry on his responsibilities which you, I, my constituents and yours each hour of the day require of him.

It was in appreciation of facts such as these that the Hill-Burton program was conceived. Leaders in the health field, with the support of the American Medical Association and under the auspices of the American Hospital Association established a Commission on Hospital Care to study this Nation's hospital resources and needs. As a result of this study, the 79th Congress on August 13, 1946, with bipartisan support enacted Public Law 725, more popularly known as the Hill-Burton Act. Representative PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, introduced the House version of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and Senator Harold Burton, of Ohio, introduced the bill in the Senate.

Since the outset of this important and unique venture in Federal, State, and local community relationships, the program has held the interest and support of a majority of Members on both sides of the aisle in the House and the Senate. I am certain it still does today.

The program has provided an orderly survey and appraisal of existing hospital and public health center resources and has required the States to develop comprehensive programs for furnishing hospital services to all population groups. The program furnishes financial assistance, on a matching basis, for the construction of hospitals, public health centers, and related facilities.

Among Federal-assistance programs this one is unique—the degree of State and local responsibility is unusual. The States develop their own programs or State plans. They determine where the hospitals and health center projects ought to be located as well as their size and type. They establish the priority of areas and must select and approve the projects prior to approval at the Federal level. In addition, the States themselves determine the amount of Federal participation which will be available to each project and this may



range from one-third to two-thirds. There is an absolute prohibition against Federal interference in the maintenance and operation of any facility assisted. The program is widely accepted throughout the Nation as an effective and orderly approach in helping to meet the needs for hospital and related health services.

The Congress has thus far authorized \$542½ million which has been matched by over a billion dollars in State and local funds. This has resulted in more than 2,000 project approvals ultimately providing 100,000 hospital beds and 400 public health centers. Over 1,100 of these projects are now completed, open, and rendering community service. These are, very briefly, the figures on the program status to date.

The program, however, has not been without criticism. Some criticism was developed at the appropriation hearings. In spite of the fact that this program represents perhaps the outstanding cooperative Federal-State-and-local venture an activity of this size must inevitably result in a few mistakes of judgment either at the local, State, or Federal level. For example, the testimony disclosed that there are three small projects in trouble under the program two of which are closed and one of which is partially closed. Certainly the fact that over 1,100 others are successfully operating would far outweigh the disadvantages. It was also shown at the hearings that there was an isolated instance of a high bed cost in which Federal participation rose to \$28,374 per bed. More typical of project costs under this program, however, is a range in cost from \$10,500 to \$17,000 per bed. Similarly there was same apprehension over and discussion at the time of the hearings concerning what may appear to be low-occupancy figures for the hospitals assisted under the program. The facts are that the hospitals assisted under the program are faring no worse than those hospitals of comparable size built without Federal assistance. In fact many of the Hill-Burton projects are running at higher occupancy rates than non-Hill-Burton projects and are providing a wider range of services and better patient care. We cannot forget that almost universally a new hospital in a community—particularly if the community never before had a hospital—finds its occupancy at a low level during the first few years.

The members will recall that the amendments to the Hospital Survey and Construction Act made by the 81st Congress in 1949 increased the annual authorization for appropriation from \$75 million to \$150 million. The program, however, has been a casualty of the international situation and our intensified mobilization efforts. We were only able to appropriate \$75 million for the current fiscal year. The so-called Truman budget proposed a continuation of the program at the \$75 million level for next year. This recommendation was particularly important since it would have assured the States and local communities of program continuity at 50 percent of the authorized level. However, the present proposal for a \$50 million

appropriation is in my opinion disastrous and must not be accepted by us today.

At the outset let me emphasize that the Nation still has a hospital-bed deficit which is variously estimated at from 733,000 to 850,000 beds. While the present program has been able to add almost 100,000 beds, and certainly a very substantial amount of hospital construction has taken place without Federal aid, the needs for beds continue to increase at an alarming rate. Gratifying progress is being made in meeting general hospital-bed needs, yet progress is particularly slow in meeting our unmet needs to care for those suffering from the mental and chronic diseases. Two-thirds of the national bed deficit is accounted for by the need to provide for patients with mental and long-term illnesses. I am advised that there is a backlog of actual projects reported by the States which can utilize \$110 million in Federal funds for fiscal years 1954 and 1955 in addition to \$43½ million already promised out by the States in anticipation of funds for 1954 and 1955.

I also am advised that our population growth alone would require 24,000 additional hospital beds each year and that obsolescence and the literal wearing out of the hospital plant in this country, for general hospitals alone, would require an additional 6,000 beds. Thus at least 30,000 additional hospital beds a year are needed just to keep up without any attempt to reduce the deficit of many hundreds of thousands of beds we accumulated in the depression years of 1929 to 1939 when funds were not available and during the World War II years when hospital construction materials were needed in the prosecution of that struggle for preservation of our way of life. At an average cost of \$16,000 per bed, \$480 million would be needed from all sources; \$50 million hardly seems adequate as the Federal contribution to assist our people to acquire hospital services which so many areas of this Nation require as essential.

In other words it would be well and fitting for me to request a restoration for this appropriation in the full amount of \$150 million authorized by the law. I know of no program where the Federal dollar could be better spent and where the returns to our people are greater. On the other hand, I am indeed conscious of the present administration's efforts to reduce expenditures at every turn. I am equally cognizant of the fact that even the most worthwhile and the best of our programs must take their fair share of budgetary cutbacks. My plea today however, is for a restoration to the \$75 million level. If we are to reduce bed deficits in the country there is a genuine need to operate the program at the full authorized level. It would be an example of "pennywise and pound-foolish" economy to cut this appropriation to \$50 million and force the program to a level which would only result in a more rapid and greater bed deficit.

In addition to the compelling need for hospital and health facilities throughout the country there is another factor of which I believe the Congress should take cognizance. I refer to situations where

the approval of larger projects in which the Federal share would take up too much of the State's allotment in any 1 year, or where the State desires to split the Federal financial participation among a group of projects for several successive fiscal years, the split-project technique is utilized in the program. Under this technique the Federal share is charged to the Federal allotment for a current fiscal year and one or more successive fiscal years. In other words, the State in approving the project on a split basis indicates to the project sponsor that Federal funds out of a future fiscal year allotment if appropriated will be allocated to them. In many instances this is the only way in which a large project can be undertaken; in other cases it affords the State an opportunity of spreading their allotments out to more than 1 or 2 projects. Admittedly, the procedure does not bind the Federal Government to approve additional projects in subsequent years nor is the Congress obligated to make funds available in subsequent fiscal years by any forward financing technique.

Following the cutback in the program from the \$150 million level after the Korean situation, the States were all cautioned against splitting projects in excess of 50 percent of their anticipated annual allotments. Thus, the States have programmed their construction, and many of them their total anticipated allotments for next year on the basis of a \$75 million appropriation. In doing so these States have made promises to communities and project sponsors throughout the Nation on the basis of an appropriation of \$75 million for next year. I submit that the States and the communities on the basis of previous congressional action had good reason to assume that the Congress would appropriate at least \$75 million for next year, which is only half of the authorized amount in the law.

I am advised that if the appropriation for next year is cut to \$50 million, 14 States: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Indiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, and Virginia will find themselves particularly embarrassed. Seventy-nine projects, the majority of them now under construction in these 14 States, will find that as a result of the cutback they may not get the amounts promised them by the States out of the 1954 appropriation. I can only speculate as to the manner in which these project sponsors can go about raising additional funds or whatever many of these projects may have to remain in an unfinished state until additional Federal funds are forthcoming. In addition to the 14 States that will be thus embarrassed, there are other States which will find themselves embarrassed as a result of developing long-range programs and advising their communities that they would be able to participate in the program next year. They will be unable to carry through on these projects. Many of us have already had inquiries about their future.

While there have been criticisms of the program for what may appear to be



isolated instances for failing to exercise sound judgment—and I personally doubt that this has been established—the program is essentially a sound one and, I believe, very well administered. This legislation embodies the concepts of Senators TAFT and HILL. In fact, it would be difficult to devise a better program of balanced Federal and State functions under the close scrutiny of State advisory councils and a Federal Hospital Council representing the fields of hospital operation, labor, agriculture, and the public. Need I remind the Members that 19 million people, or 1 out of every 8, will be hospitalized this year, and that 95 percent of the babies born today are born in hospitals. It is significant that 85 million people are members of voluntary hospital prepayment plans. Our hospitals are, indeed, important to our Nation; the need is great.

It is for all of these reasons, therefore, that I find it compelling to request the House to restore this appropriation item to \$75 million.

In addition, I should like to direct the attention of the Members to the item for salaries and expenses. For the past several years we have been reducing the amount appropriated for these purposes to the point where the program, at the \$75 million level, is utilizing \$1,200,000 for salaries and expenses. The so-called Truman budget included \$1,200,000 for these purposes. Secretary Hobby's budget recommendation, at the \$60 million level, was \$1,125,000. The present proposal of \$750,000 is, I believe, much too drastic a cut. I would think that, at the \$75 million level, this program requires a minimum of \$1,200,000 in order to adequately protect the Government's expenditure of funds and its investment in hospital and public health center facilities. There is no other program of its kind which has accomplished so much in contributing to our Nation's security through efforts to maintain our health on so small an appropriation for salaries and expenses. Under no circumstances do I believe that the program should be permitted to continue with less than the \$1,125,000 recommended by the Secretary for salaries and expenses.

What are the relative values to a community of a sick mother returned quickly in good health to her working husband and children? Who has counted the value of the speedy return of a shop foreman to his work in good health? Of a farmer to our agricultural economy? Of a businessman to his store? Of a minister to his congregation? Of a doctor to his patients? Of a legislator to his duties? Yes, of a school child to his studies? He, someday, will be our successors struggling as we are with the great issues of his day. In short, I believe our Nation's wealth is our Nation's health. We must maintain, conserve, and preserve it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested to hear the gentleman from Rhode Island refer again this time to the particular item in this bill as being a nonpartisan item. I thoroughly agree with that; I

think the items in regard to the sick, those that affect our children, our education, the handicapped, the women, the Negroes, and all other groups are nonpartisan in character. But in listening to this debate and listening to this particular item I am beginning to wonder whether or not balancing the budget is a nonpartisan issue; and, indeed, it looks very clear to me that balancing the budget has certainly become a partisan issue. I have yet to see anyone among a certain group on the other side of the aisle get up and try to hold this budget in shape. I have had to listen, on the contrary, to these emotional appeals; and, incidentally, let me say in regard to these emotional appeals, that I, too, have those same emotions, the same feeling for the women and the children and the sick and the handicapped; and I am deeply concerned about it. I think we are all concerned about it, but I submit that the overreaching problem that is facing us at this particular time is inflation as it affects those people because if we continue to operate under an unbalanced budget we are going to reduce the purchasing power of the dollar even more and in effect we are not going to be giving them the funds that we say we are giving them here. Furthermore, if we continue this program of unbalancing the budget—and if you want to make a partisan issue of it I think it should be very clear that that is exactly what you are doing—we will soon have a 40-cent then a 30-cent dollar. I could get up here on this floor and make an emotional argument about many of these programs because I feel deeply about their stated objectives; but every single time you plead for more money you are asking to that extent for an unbalanced budget. And when you make these additions cumulative by advocating and voting for them all you place your vote against a balanced budget on this partisan basis.

If we are ever going to get our government back to the communities and back to private enterprise we are going to have to reduce the tax burden that the Federal Government is imposing on our people. As long as the Federal Government takes the tax money, the State and local governments cannot get the dollars; and, incidentally, the community chest and other private donations cannot help your private hospitals. Your private institutions that are really set up to handle these problems of the handicapped and the sick and the needy cannot get the money. To the extent that we continue to insist on the Federal Government taking care of these problems we take tax money away from the local communities and out of the pockets of the private citizens, bring it down here to Washington, and, incidentally, not returning dollar for dollar. For every time we collect a tax the actual amount returned to any State for these purposes is considerably less.

Somewhere along the line we are going to have to face this. The solution is very clear to me; it has been very clear throughout this entire debate: Every time we have an emotional issue the plea is to put more money in the bill. The

net result is going to be just as the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] stated. We are going to have a bigger budget; we are going to spend more money this year than last year. Somewhere we have to look at the other side of the picture, and I am appealing to this Congress to use a little statesmanship and let us try to balance the budget if we can. I could not be more sympathetic with this problem of hospitals, but we have to look at the overall picture; we must be men enough to recognize that we cannot do all these things that we wish we could this particular year; we have to realize that we have a limited amount of money to spend and try to cut the garment according to the cloth.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first I wish to express my high commendation to my very able, distinguished friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], for his splendid, constructive, forward-looking contributions to the discussion of this bill.

Regarding the pending bill, I may say that I have been very much interested since the adoption of the Hill-Burton bill in adequate appropriations for community hospital projects throughout the Nation. I believe that action by Congress in providing sufficient funds to help the States carry out this vital, and in all so many instances, urgently needed work, it is a very high-priority obligation of the Congress.

Adequate medical facilities and reasonable medical costs are certainly among the great social problems now facing us. The various States, local communities, and private organizations have done much to expand both the scope and the quality of medical services in recent years so that today we can truly point with pride to the fact that American medical service, care, and treatment, is the best in the world. That does not mean that it is free of shortcomings or inadequacies. Advancement and progress still remain before us and programs to these ends must be conducted according to the American pattern rather than the pattern of the socialized police state.

This does not mean, however, that the Federal Government should not take a hand in helping the States and the local communities to provide necessary medical and nursing services and the best of care for our people. That was one of the objectives of the Hill-Burton bill and that is why I am supporting this amendment to restore current appropriations to a figure which, while it will still be insufficient, in my opinion, nevertheless will afford some reasonable approach to these problems. One of the best ways that this Congress can encourage socialized medicine and its known evils would be to deny sufficient funds for hospital construction and adequate medical care for millions of American who so desperately need these benefits. Maintaining the national health and the national well-being should be indeed a primary concern of this Congress. If we reject the appeals for sufficient funds to conduct these programs, we will, I think, put ourselves in the unfortunate posi-



tion of appearing to deprive our citizens of modernized medical attention and treatment which is urgently needed to maintain the national public health and to keep our entire people strong and vigorous at a time when strength, vigor, and physical soundness are so essential to the Nation.

I am very much afraid, in fact I am convinced, that unless this amendment prevails we will suffer a definite setback to the long-range hospital construction program in many parts of the Nation. Speaking of my own State, the proposed cut to \$50 million would seriously endanger work in progress on pending hospital-building projects and would also make necessary the postponement of about 14 other projects, applications for which are now under study.

To say the least, and I say it entirely without any reflection upon any members of the committee, all of whom I greatly respect, this is misguided economy. It is bound to create confusion and undue delay to hospital construction throughout the country. Those States like Massachusetts and many others which have complied with all of the requirements of the Federal Government in formulating a carefully prepared program to meet the hospital needs of its people, will be penalized because the Federal Government is not living up to a promise it has already made through the enactment of the Hill-Burton Construction Act.

It is false and misleading economy because the Congress will be called upon at a later date to appropriate the money which is being claimed as a saving here today.

I favor sound, sane, sensible, practical economy as much as anyone, as my votes in the House show, but I think this curtailment of essential health services is extremely shortsighted and certainly ill-advised and this is particularly so in the face of the grandiose, welfare programs upon which we have embarked on a global scale taking care of the peoples of remote lands while so often turning our backs on our own people. By all means let us act upon the needs of our own people and when and if cuts are made, let us make them where they properly belong, and not at the expense of the sick and the afflicted and the handicapped and the poor and the legion of earnest, hard working men and women of the rank and file throughout the Nation.

There are few things that have ever come before this House upon which I have been called upon to vote which have touched me more deeply than this question, because cuts like this, and some of the others proposed in this bill, strike at the very heart of many meritorious programs which we have set up for the proper care and treatment of those who are unable to care for themselves, yes, and services which we have provided for the weak, the infirm, and the handicapped. I wholeheartedly and most earnestly urge my colleagues in the House to reinstate the \$75 million request, an amount which is exactly one-half that originally authorized by the Congress in amendments to the Hill-

Burton Act. Seventy-five million dollars is to my mind inadequate. The purpose is so wholesome, and desirable, and beneficial, that I believe it should be more, and I would so vote, but it certainly cannot be less and still permit much more than token support for this splendid program. In the interest of economy, we have already cut \$75 million yearly from the hospital construction program. Let us not emasculate still further this vital program, which is doing so much to enable so many American communities to take care of chronic illness cases and all the urgent hospital, medical, and nursing needs of our people, by another cut of \$25 million.

To illustrate how deficient the \$50 million appropriation is, let me point out that according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the total number of approvable Hill-Burton applications now pending in the States is 338, representing a total estimated cost of about \$302 million, of which the Federal share is estimated to be about \$105 million or—and mind you this—just about twice as much as the current proposed appropriation. In addition, let us keep in mind that State health agencies have already made tentative commitments of Federal funds on projects already approved amounting to approximately \$43 million over the next 2 years.

Let me also stress this point—that one of the most important domestic problems facing the American people today is that of sufficient and adequate hospital and medical care. We have made great progress to be sure but there is still unquestionably great need throughout the Nation for additional hospital facilities and less costly hospital, medical, and nursing care. The solution to these problems must be found, I repeat, in the American way, and not in the way of the police state.

In my opinion, to strike at such vital needs of our people at this time would be to work a great disservice upon our current health programs in practically every State in the Union and I hope that the Congress will not give further support to the claims of the advocates of socialized medicine by whittling down reasonable appropriations for health and hospital programs like the ones presented by this bill.

I will vote for this amendment and I hope that the House will pass it. Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include a letter from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and also a tabular study of hospital construction in Massachusetts:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,  
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,  
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1953.  
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: This is in reply to the request from Mr. Gaucher of your office for information relative to the Hill-Burton program.

At the present time the State agencies have 388 approvable applications pending in their files for Hill-Burton aid. These applications represent a total estimated cost of \$302,026,000 and would require approxi-

mately \$105,074,000 of Federal aid. In addition, State agencies have made tentative commitments of Federal funds on projects already approved amounting to approximately \$43,500,000 over the next 2 years. The States of North Dakota, New Jersey, New Mexico, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming, and the Virgin Islands did not submit a report on projects pending.

We are attaching a narrative report showing the program to date in Massachusetts, and the name and location of projects requesting aid under the program in that State during the next 2 years.

I hope this material will provide the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

V. M. HOGE,  
Assistant Surgeon General, Acting  
Chief, Bureau of Medical Services.

#### HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION IN MASSACHUSETTS

MAY 18, 1953.

##### Program to date:

The Public Health Service has approved 54 projects for Massachusetts, as follows: 47 general hospital projects, 1 tuberculosis unit, 3 chronic units, 2 public health centers and 1 State laboratory.

Of the 2,483 hospital beds which will be added in these facilities, 1,730 are general, 36 for tuberculosis patients, and 717 for chronic patients.

The total cost of the projects is \$62,156,200, of which \$12,571,000 is the Federal share.

Pending applications: Fourteen projects are currently pending which, when approved by the State agency and the United States Public Health Service, could add an additional 890 general beds for a total estimated cost of \$17,463,000 of which the estimated Federal share would be \$2,926,000.

A description of facilities completed or currently under construction and a list of pending projects are attached.

#### PROGRESS IN HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION IN MASSACHUSETTS

A summary of all the projects approved under Public Law 725 is as follows:

1. Glover Memorial Hospital, Needham. An addition of 68 beds and 16 bassinets has been completed. The existing facilities have been altered for administrative offices.
2. Athol Memorial Hospital. This facility became the first general hospital in the Athol area. A quota of 46 beds and 16 bassinets was constructed. Hospital opened in 1950.
3. Clinton Hospital. An addition of 39 beds has been completed and several old buildings demolished. Bed capacity on completion, 98. New facility opened in 1950.
4. Lawrence Memorial, Medford. An addition of 41 beds and 5 bassinets is being built, 107 beds and 34 bassinets on completion.
5. Emerson Hospital, Concord. Building an addition of 23 beds and 4 bassinets. Capacity on completion 60 beds and 18 bassinets. Construction has been completed.
6. (a) Children's Hospital, Boston. Completed an addition of 66 beds for chronic disease. (b) Service tower for connecting bridge to laboratories.
7. Milton Hospital. Constitutes a new facility in a new location and provides 56 beds and 12 bassinets. Present building to be used as a convalescent home.
8. Cape Cod Hospital, Hyannis. Added 30 beds for chronic disease. Construction completed in 1950.
9. Wing Memorial, Palmer. This is a new facility in a new location to provide 42 beds and 12 bassinets.
10. Public Health Center, Quincy. A new building, combined offices, clinics, and laboratories in one building. Construction completed, 1951.
11. Brockton Hospital. An addition of 46 beds and 15 bassinets has been completed.



12. Marlboro Hospital. There are 36 beds and 11 bassinets being added to increase the capacity of the hospital to 97 beds and 26 bassinets.

13. Bon Secours Hospital, Methuen. An equipment project has been completed at this new facility of 116 beds and 32 bassinets. New facility opened in 1950. Participations under Public Law 725 for equipment only.

14. St. Luke's Hospital, New Bedford. An addition of 68 beds and 8 bassinets to increase capacity to 341 beds and 55 bassinets.

15. Community Memorial Hospital, Ayer. Completed an addition of 16 beds and 10 bassinets to increase capacity of hospital to 39 beds and 10 bassinets.

16. Mary Lane, Ware. Project completed, 21 beds and 20 bassinets added to increase capacity to 55 beds and 20 bassinets.

17. Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary, Boston. Completed an addition of 22 beds, operating rooms, and other related facilities for teaching purposes.

18. Beth Israel Hospital, Boston. Completed an addition for 165 beds and 91 bassinets to increase capacity to 363 beds and 91 bassinets. A Federal grant was made toward the purchase of equipment for the new facility.

19. Winchester Hospital. Now in the process of constructing an addition of 35 beds and 36 bassinets.

20. Boston Lying-In Hospital. Completed an addition to the out-patient department to provide additional facilities for teaching purposes.

21. Franklin County Public Hospital, Greenfield. Constructing an addition to provide 48 beds and 8 bassinets. Bed capacity on completion will be 150 beds and 41 bassinets.

22. (a) Peter Bent Brigham, Boston. Completed an addition to provide 39 beds for teaching purposes. (b) Out-patient facilities two projects.

23. New England Deaconess, Boston. Now in the process of constructing a wing to provide 76 beds for chronic disease.

24. Symmes Arlington Hospital, Arlington. Construction to increase facilities of the out-patient department and other related services. Construction completed in 1951.

25. St. Elizabeth's Hospital, Boston. Completed an addition of 153 beds to increase capacity of hospital to 400 beds. Federal grant is made toward the purchase of equipment.

26. Chaote Memorial Hospital, Woburn. Constructing a wing to provide 44 beds and 6 bassinets. Construction completed in 1951. The hospital now has 88 beds and 18 bassinets.

27. Hyams Laboratory, Boston, laboratory facilities.

28. Jewish Memorial Hospital, Roxbury. Constructing a wing to provide 50 beds for chronic disease.

29. Barnstable County Sanitarium, Pocasset. Now in process of constructing an addition to provide 34 beds for chronic disease.

30. New England Sanitarium, Stoneham. Constructing a wing to provide 132 beds for chronic disease.

31. Holyoke Hospital. Construction started in July 1951, on a wing to provide 102 beds and 8 bassinets. On completion the hospital will have 183 beds and 44 bassinets.

32. St. Joseph's, Lowell. To construct an addition for 59 beds, administrative offices, kitchen, operating rooms, and other related facilities. Construction started in October 1951.

33. Lowell General Hospital, Lowell. To construct a new pediatric and maternity building to house 74 patients, a new delivery suite, central sterile supply, powerplant, and laundry alterations.

34. Leonard Morse Hospital, Natick. Now constructing a wing to provide 36 beds and 15 bassinets. On completion the hospital will have 128 beds and 32 bassinets.

35. Anna Jacques Hospital, Newburyport. Now planning to construct a wing to provide 20 beds and 18 bassinets. On completion the bed capacity will be 73 beds and 28 bassinets.

36. Winthrop Community Hospital. Completed alterations to nursery to meet requirement of the State Department of Public Health and the addition of a milk formula and suspect nursery in adjacent wing.

37. Union Hospital, Lynn. In process of constructing a new general hospital to replace existing facility. The hospital will contain 75 beds and 20 bassinets.

38. Framingham Union, Framingham. To construct an addition to provide 174 beds, kitchen, laboratories, administrative offices, and other related facilities. Alterations to present building to accommodate 49 patients. Operating rooms, and delivery rooms.

39. Holden District Hospital, Holden. To construct a new wing to provide 41 beds, and nursery wing for 11 bassinets. Alterations to existing building will provide 10 beds for pediatric. On completion the hospital will have 60 beds and 11 bassinets. Construction started in December 1951.

40. Carney Hospital, Boston. In process of constructing a new general hospital to replace existing facility. The hospital on completion will have 315 beds and no bassinets. Federal grant is made toward the purchase of equipment.

41. Brookline Health Center, Brookline. A new building to combine offices, clinics, and laboratories in one building.

42. Municipal Hospital, Springfield. In process of constructing a new chronic disease hospital to replace an existing facility. The hospital on completion will provide 237 beds for intensive medical care and 200 beds for ambulant patients.

43. Wasson Maternity Hospital, Springfield. In process of constructing a new maternity hospital to replace existing facility. The hospital on completion will provide 81 beds and 104 bassinets.

44. Malden Hospital, Malden. To construct a wing to existing general hospital to provide 56 beds for chronic disease patients.

45. (a) Norwood Hospital, Norwood. In process of constructing an addition to existing facility. The new addition will provide 50 beds and the hospital will have 143 beds on completion. (b) Operating suite and other facilities.

46. Holyoke Municipal Hospital, Holyoke. To construct a new chronic hospital to replace existing facility. The new building will provide 100 beds for intensive medical care and 50 beds for ambulatory cases.

47. Boston City Hospital, Boston. To construct an addition to existing Pediatric Building to provide a modern premature baby section with related facilities. This will total 30 bassinets.

48. Groton Community Hospital, Groton. A new general hospital to replace existing facility. The new building will provide 41 beds and 8 bassinets on completion.

49. Henry Heywood Hospital, Gardner. Alterations and additions to improve autopsy, X-ray department, laboratory, fracture room, patients toilets, administration offices, obstetric patient nursing unit, delivery equipment, surgical department, and elevator. Project mainly to improve services but will add 4 beds in process.

50. Marthas Vineyard Hospital, Oak Bluffs. Adds 11 beds.

51. New England Center, Boston. Pathology laboratory.

52. South Shore Hospital, South Weymouth. Adds 40 general beds.

53. St. Vincents, Worcester. Equipment only.

#### Pending applications in Massachusetts

Location	Name of facility	Beds added	Estimated total cost	Estimated Federal share
North Adams	North Adams	123	\$1,826,000	\$225,000
Holyoke	Providence	74	2,234,000	225,000
Amherst	Public-health center		1,281,000	200,000
Worcester	Hahnemann	50	1,347,000	142,000
Fitchburg	Burbank	120	2,200,000	250,000
Taunton	Morton	75	1,500,000	250,000
Fall River	Union	50	700,000	250,000
Fall River	St. Anne's	50	1,250,000	250,000
Boston	Memorial Teachers Clinic		1,000,000	250,000
Brockton	Goddard	50	750,000	250,000
Northampton	Cooley-Dickinson	100	1,500,000	250,000
Ipswich	Benjamin Cable	19	375,000	150,000
Webster	Webster district	40	750,000	150,000
Danvers	Danvers	40	750,000	84,000
Total, 14 projects			17,463,000	2,926,000

(Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when the former distinguished chairman of this committee was speaking, I think he inadvertently said that, under the school-maintenance-and-operation program, the Office of Education had to wait until the end of June to see what applications for funds would amount to. The actual cutoff date for applications is March 31.

My very good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Philbin], who has just finished speaking in the well of the House, said, "Let us make cuts where they belong." I think that is a very good

slogan. In my opinion, it would not be necessary to quibble about a few million dollars for such worthy domestic programs as are contained in this bill, if we had not sent to the four corners of the globe, for what I have many times called Operation Rathole, approximately \$130 billion—an amount which is almost one-half of our entire national debt. You could have everything the budget requested, and a great deal more, as far as my vote is concerned. But, we do have an obligation, we do have a responsibility that should not be forgotten because of the emotional appeal of the programs provided for in this bill. We have an obligation to keep this Government solvent so that we will not go down; because when we go down, the entire world will go down.

Now let us look at this situation for just a minute. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Is-



land is adopted, it means \$15 million above the Eisenhower budget. I think my good friend, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE], referred to the technique that is being used before the House today. This is a good example.

As far as the American Hospital Association is concerned, it is not infallible. And, I must disagree with the statement of the gentleman from Rhode Island that there is 100-percent approval of this program. The other day, I received the following telegram from a member of the Illinois Hospital Association and the American Hospital Association:

We hope you can completely eliminate the Hill-Burton hospital-construction program. We do not need it. This bill is being supported by a minority group who have little conception of our hospital needs. Their interests are solely selfish.

That telegram was from a well-known doctor in Chicago.

Here is a member of the Illinois Hospital Association and also the American Hospital Association, who leaves no doubt as to his stand against this pro-

gram. That is certainly not 100 percent, as far as I can see.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Is the telegram the gentleman has just read sent by a recognized official of either one of these two institutions or is it signed by an individual who belongs to the associations?

Mr. BUSBEY. He says he is a member of the Illinois Hospital Association and American Hospital Association.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Does he affix any other name to it?

Mr. BUSBEY. No, not as an official of either organization. He included his name. He is a very prominent doctor in Chicago.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that there are now many empty beds in the hospitals that have been constructed with these funds?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes. I will insert in the RECORD tables for certain States showing the occupancy of hospitals that have been built under the Hill-Burton program. You will be amazed at the low occupancy as compared to the average occupancy, or the norm, that should be maintained in order to operate a hospital efficiently.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that some of these hospitals are not even half occupied?

Mr. BUSBEY. The record will show that the average occupancy of many is not over 30 percent of capacity; and of some, it is even less than that.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. BUSBEY. This is the official record from the Public Health Service, that administers the program. They are not my figures, but the figures compiled by the people who are administering the program.

Under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, I include tables from eight States, furnished by the United States Public Health Service:

## ALABAMA

Location	Name	Category	Type construction	Beds added	Beds upon completion	Date opened	Percent occupied	Source of information <sup>1</sup>	Architect fees	Total cost	Federal share
Ashland	Clay Co.	General	New	20	20	September 1951	52	S. P.	\$13,149	\$270,102	\$175,034
Athens	Athens Limestone Co.	do	do	50	50	May 1951	28	R. O.	35,000	672,134	439,241
Birmingham <sup>2</sup>	Carraway Methodist	do	Addition		240	April 1950	64	S. P.	30,028	554,443	184,515
Do	365 Crippled Child. Cl.	do	New	100	100	July 1951	76	S. P.	86,659	1,876,969	566,018
Do	St. Vincents	do	Addition	90	213	November 1950	67	S. P.	73,298	1,559,473	483,206
Decatur	Dist. 1 TB San.	TB	New	161	161	December 1951	97	S. P.	55,651	1,144,693	754,984
Fort Payne	De Kalb Co. Gen.	General	do	55	55	April 1952	31	S. P.	33,562	606,235	400,554
Hamilton	Lister Hill	do	do	37	37	December 1951	19	R. O.	24,175	451,645	286,363
Langdale	Geo. H. Lanier Mem.	do	do	87	87	August 1950	73	R. O.	106,000	2,106,398	719,009
Marion	Perry Co.	do	do	20	20	January 1951	49	R. O.	10,195	225,386	73,438
Mobile	Martin De Porres	do	do	35	35	May 1950	84	R. O.	29,652	611,425	195,475
Mobile	Mobile Infirmary	do	do	300	300	January 1952		N. I.	216,416	4,368,580	2,781,509
Do	Providence	do	do	200	200	August 1952		N. I.	167,274	3,551,404	2,000,000
Do	Psy. Rec. & Diag. Unit	Mental	Addition	20	320	May 1951		N. I.	8,710	138,001	45,000
Montgomery	St. Jude	General	New	152	152	June 1951	45	R. O.	67,131	1,345,067	438,663
Opelika	Lee Co. Hosp. & HC	General and public health clinic	do	80	80	February 1952		N. I.	48,253	1,040,211	653,340
Opp	Mizell Mem.	General	do	29	29	December 1949	55	R. O.	21,707	470,998	153,666
Ozark	Dale Co.	do	do	50	50	August 1951	24	R. O.	37,529	572,672	381,029
Tuscaloosa	Bryce	Mental	Addition	125	2,058	July 1950		N. I.	12,000	346,408	230,137
Tuskegee	Macon Co.	General	do	( <sup>3</sup> )	30	do		N. I.		160,670	23,780
Union Springs	Bullock Co.	do	do	28	28	July 1951	78	R. O.	16,987	320,804	206,143
Vernon	Lamar Co.	do	do	30	30	November 1952		N. I.	22,800	455,702	298,802

## CALIFORNIA

Alturas	Modoc Gen.	General	New	39	39	April 1951	49	S. P.	\$55,313	\$841,000	\$275,000
Banning	San Geronimo Pass Mem.	do	do	37	37	March 1951	30	S. P.	34,367	591,501	183,300
Bishop	Northern Inyo	do	do	30	30	November 1949	48	S. A.	21,266	473,230	155,327
Brawley	Pioneers Mem.	do	do	100	100	October 1950	50	S. A.	101,278	1,566,019	491,991
Corcoran	Corcoran Municipal	do	do	( <sup>7</sup> )	( <sup>7</sup> )	January 1949	44	S. A.		48,004	16,001
Dinuba	Alta	General and public health clinic	do	50	50	February 1951	50	S. A.	50,677	812,516	266,805
Escondido	Palomar Mem.	General	do	37	37	February 1950	83	S. A.	24,900	466,328	155,442
Gridley	Biggs Gridley Mem.	do	do	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )	June 1949	83	S. A.		370,385	16,248
Hemet	Hemet Valley	do	Addition and remodeling	10	35	April 1949	70	S. A.	16,409	265,543	88,514
Inglewood	Gentile Valley Comm.	do	Addition and replacement	39	98	September 1952		N. I.	12,082	200,546	63,938
Loyalton	Sierra Valley	do	do	10	10	July 1951	40	S. A.	11,227	180,415	50,722
Mariposa	John C. Fremont	do	do	20	20	October 1951	75	S. A.		418,717	126,433
Merced	County	do	Addition	88	88	February 1952	77	S. P.	63,860	1,131,782	371,060
Modesto	Mem. Stanislaus Co.	do	New	92	92	do		S. A.	80,057	1,211,575	400,000
Modesto	Stanislaus Co. Cent. Unit	do	Addition	17	177	September 1951	64	S. A.	82,406	1,465,575	323,772
Needles	Municipal	do	Addition and remodeling	10	20	September 1952		N. I.		277,910	89,672
Paso Robles <sup>4</sup>	Paso Robles War Mem.	do	New	24	24	December 1949	39	S. A.	37,957	598,051	109,330
Patterson	Patterson Hosp. Dist.	do	do	25	25	August 1950	40	S. A.	28,000	445,254	145,160
Roseville <sup>5</sup>	Roseville Municipal	do	do	( <sup>3</sup> )	26	November 1952		N. I.		277,950	17,000
San Andreas	Mark Twain	do	do	30	30	October 1951	57	S. A.	58,391	627,507	209,169
San Rafael	Marin District	do	do	108	108	May 1952		N. I.	107,470	1,825,702	576,920
Tracy	Tracy Community Mem.	do	do	42	42	December 1948	50	S. A.	11,327	227,979	73,583
Truckee	Tahoe Forest District	do	do	21	21	April 1952		N. I.	24,917	403,238	127,747
Tulare	Tulare District	do	do	73	73	February 1951	43	S. A.	80,746	1,299,500	416,500
Ventura	Foster Mem.	do	Addition and remodeling	20	80	March 1951	62	S. P.	27,745	415,805	138,602
Weaverville	Trinity Co.	do	New	20	20	July 1950	84	S. A.	18,198	352,215	117,405
Willows	Glenn Co.	do	do	42	42	November 1950	53	S. A.	29,014	638,824	211,275

See footnotes at end of table.



## GEORGIA

Location	Name	Category	Type construction	Beds added	Beds upon completion	Date opened	Percent occupied	Source of information <sup>1</sup>	Architect fees	Total cost	Federal share
Adel <sup>4</sup>	The Memorial	General	New	25	25	August 1950	60	R. O.	\$8,888	\$193,800	\$116,280
Arlington	Arlington City	do	do	16	16	April 1951	8	R. O.	9,436	158,900	95,340
Athens	Athens Gen.	do	Addition	22	106	do	69	S. P.	29,168	522,900	184,300
Atlanta	Grady Mem. Negro	do	do	116	116	July 1952	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	91,632	1,725,984	1,035,590
Baxley	Baxley Appling Co.	do	New	27	27	June 1951	52	R. O.	13,547	257,196	154,318
Camilla	Mitchell Co.	do	do	32	32	September 1949	54	R. O.	12,310	268,139	89,380
Carrollton	Tanner Mem.	do	do	40	40	November 1949	46	R. O.	24,422	528,000	176,000
Cedartown	Polk Gen.	do	Addition and remodeling.	10	40	July 1951	85	S. P.	3,604	69,500	41,700
Chatsworth	Murray Co. Mem.	do	New	( <sup>9</sup> )	19	January 1950	47	S. P.	---	41,000	13,667
Clayton	Rabun Co.	do	do	20	20	November 1951	29	S. P.	15,924	237,000	130,350
Columbus	St. Francis	do	do	154	154	April 1950	51	R. O.	97,823	1,909,807	636,602
Dawson	Terrell Co.	do	do	27	27	April 1951	23	R. O.	12,008	255,868	153,520
Demorest	Habersham Co.	do	do	44	44	July 1952	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	33,511	555,200	302,625
Dublin	Laurens Co.	do	do	60	60	September 1952	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	44,400	886,068	487,337
Elberton	Elbert Co.	do	do	50	50	September 1950	100	R. O.	42,500	780,276	260,092
Franklin <sup>5</sup>	Heard Co. Mem.	do	do	18	18	May 1949	57	S. P.	---	17,217	5,739
Gainesville	Hall Co. Mem.	do	do	112	112	September 1951	27	R. O.	86,935	1,666,228	536,102
Greensboro	Minnie G. Boswell Mem.	do	do	28	28	August 1949	51	R. O.	23,311	401,250	133,750
Griffin	Griffin-Spalding Co.	do	do	101	101	January 1951	70	S. P.	75,381	1,321,491	440,497
Hiwassee <sup>4</sup>	Lee M. Happ, Jr. Mem.	do	do	12	12	February 1952	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	11,821	179,604	98,782
Lagrange	City-County	do	Addition	74	140	September 1949	65	S. P.	25,383	504,000	168,000
Macon	Macon City	do	do	24	324	August 1948	98	S. P.	3,274	57,834	19,278
Marietta <sup>4</sup>	Kennestone	do	New	103	103	June 1950	41	R. O.	48,290	1,208,564	402,855
McRae	Telfair Co.	do	do	30	30	March 1952	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	17,375	360,000	198,000
Monticello	Jasper Co.	do	do	25	25	January 1952	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	12,500	260,000	143,000
Richland	Stewart-Webster	do	do	24	24	March 1949	50	R. O.	14,525	255,536	85,179
Rome	Batley State	Tuberculosis	Remodeling	( <sup>7</sup> )	---	March 1952	82	S. P.	9,604	153,413	84,377
Royston	Cobb Mem.	General	New	20	20	January 1950	54	R. O.	13,575	213,460	71,153
Summerville	Chattooga Co.	do	do	31	31	January 1952	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	16,658	345,000	189,750
Swainsboro	Emanuel Co.	do	do	50	50	June 1952	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	29,235	591,790	355,074
Sylvania	Sereven Co. Gen.	do	do	34	34	September 1951	34	R. O.	---	332,000	199,200
Sylvester	Worth Co.	do	do	29	29	February 1950	56	R. O.	14,594	293,114	97,705
Thomaston	Upson Co.	do	do	100	100	April 1951	33	R. O.	64,138	1,122,000	374,000
Thomson	McDuffie Co.	do	do	29	29	January 1952	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	15,747	325,500	195,300
Tooea	Stephens Co.	do	Addition and remodeling.	5	44	July 1952	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	22,683	424,000	254,400
Waynesboro	Waynesboro Burke Co.	do	New	33	33	May 1951	30	R. O.	20,421	416,070	249,642
Windber	Barrow Co.	do	do	40	40	December 1951	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	31,487	550,000	302,500

## ILLINOIS

Aledo	Mercer Co.	General	New	50	50	December 1950	51	S. A.	\$50,707	\$801,233	\$267,678
Anna	Anna City	do	do	50	50	March 1951	58	S. A.	60,083	1,161,976	387,325
Cairo	St. Marys Nurses Home	do	Addition	---	95	October 1949	72	S. P.	11,824	402,754	134,251
Carlinville	Carlinville Gen.	do	New	53	53	July 1952	46	S. A.	46,850	912,000	353,856
Carbidge	Hancock Co.	do	do	50	50	October 1950	61	S. A.	42,767	741,475	245,159
Chicago	Provident Hosp. Trg. Sch.	do	Addition and remodeling.	30	210	August 1951	63	S. P.	42,964	527,000	204,476
Do	Illinois Masonic	do	Addition	70	470	June 1951	61	S. P.	22,165	1,008,302	160,428
Evanston	Community	do	Replacement	50	50	October 1952	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	40,678	940,000	364,720
Fairfield	Fairfield Mem.	do	New	100	100	July 1950	82	S. A.	69,789	1,242,983	414,328
Flora	Clay Co.	do	New	50	50	March 1950	42	S. A.	44,392	906,295	302,099
Gibson	Gibson Comm.	do	do	40	40	October 1952	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	38,250	800,000	310,400
Lawrenceville	Lawrence Co.	General and public health clinic.	do	50	50	July 1950	49	S. A.	46,680	971,100	323,700
Mount Carmel	Wabash Co.	General	do	52	52	June 1951	60	S. A.	45,175	904,963	301,654
Mount Vernon	Good Samaritan	do	do	100	100	May 1952	62	S. A.	114,446	2,199,000	733,000
Do	State TB San.	TB	do	100	100	May 1951	43	S. P.	57,237	2,117,267	446,693
Peoria <sup>5</sup>	St. Francis Forest Pk.	General	Addition	---	591	August 1950	84	S. P.	2,619	1,166,524	71,401
Red Bud <sup>4</sup>	St. Clements	do	do	64	64	October 1949	79	S. A.	36,226	1,096,339	238,576

## MINNESOTA

Anoka	Anoka State	Mental	Addition	60	832	March 1952	123	S. P.	\$64,830	\$1,233,312	\$553,190
Appleton	Appleton Mun.	General	Replacement	20	20	July 1952	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	20,706	429,606	185,403
Bagley	Clearwater Co. Mem.	do	New	30	30	August 1950	87	S. A.	16,062	331,160	110,387
Baudette	Baudette Mun.	do	do	24	24	March 1950	72	S. A.	16,436	333,279	110,225
Benson	Swift Co.-Benson	do	do	( <sup>9</sup> )	40	June 1950	59	S. A.	2,300	371,611	37,973
Blue Earth	Community Mem.	do	do	32	32	September 1950	48	S. A.	25,663	454,695	151,565
Breckenridge	St. Francis and NH	do	do	123	123	September 1952	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	105,791	2,162,143	971,254
Buffalo	Buffalo Mem.	do	do	28	28	September 1951	63	S. A.	17,393	358,696	160,518
Crookston <sup>5</sup>	St. Francis	do	do	140	140	June 1950	60	S. A.	---	1,865,793	79,282
Duluth <sup>5</sup>	St. Lukes Hosp.	do	Addition and remodeling.	---	355	December 1951	103	S. P.	---	2,435,000	15,750
Duluth	St. Lukes Infirmary	Chronic	New	150	473	November 1951	96	S. A.	63,362	1,161,961	387,320
Greenbusb <sup>4</sup>	Greenbusb Community	General	do	20	20	February 1950	65	S. A.	11,798	250,585	74,948
Litchfield	Meeker Co.	do	do	62	62	June 1952	50	S. A.	45,590	870,290	391,630
Minneapolis	Variety Club Heart	Chronic	do	78	78	March 1951	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	49,789	1,400,507	381,672
Morris	Stevens Co. Mem.	General	do	40	40	February 1951	50	S. A.	26,528	544,650	245,092
New Prague	Community Mem.	do	do	32	32	February 1952	56	S. A.	28,011	429,472	193,262
Olivia	The Renville Co.	do	do	41	41	February 1951	61	S. A.	19,327	399,920	133,306
Ortonville	Ortonville Mun.	do	do	30	30	April 1952	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	18,823	377,335	169,801
Pelican Rapids	Pelican Valley HC	do	do	23	23	August 1951	52	S. A.	12,698	263,730	118,679
Red Lake Falls	St. Johns	do	do	20	20	October 1951	56	S. A.	19,170	416,023	186,337
Redwood Falls	Redwood Falls	do	Replacement	40	40	November 1952	---	N. I. <sup>9</sup>	26,918	537,446	241,851
Sauk Centre	St. Michaels	do	New	50	50	September 1950	73	S. A.	35,705	760,971	253,657
Slayton	Murray Co. Mem.	do	do	40	40	February 1951	38	S. P.	22,729	469,347	150,745
Wells	Village of Wells Hosp.	do	do	32	32	October 1950	35	S. A.	15,540	331,751	110,583
Wheaton	Wheaton Community	do	do	22	22	December 1950	44	S. A.	11,406	251,008	83,429
Worthington	Worthington Mun.	do	do	50	76	May 1951	50	S. A.	34,943	682,922	227,141
Do	do	do	Addition	27	76	do		S. A.	17,162	314,004	140,972

See footnotes at end of table.



## MISSISSIPPI

Location	Name	Category	Type construction	Beds added	Beds upon completion	Date opened	Percent occupied	Source of information <sup>1</sup>	Architect fees	Total cost	Federal share
Ripley	Tippah Co. Hosp.	General	New	40	40	April 1950	62	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	\$15,902	\$448,307	\$145,229
Ashland	Ashland Clinic	General Public Health clinic	do	6	6	September 1951		N. I. <sup>2</sup>	3,711	122,456	80,874
Belzoni	Humphreys Co. Mem.	General	do	40	40	January 1951	48	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	15,250	335,000	108,250
Booneville	NE Mississippi	do	do	50	50	December 1949	99	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	19,314	600,973	195,638
Canton	Kings Daughters	do	Remodeling	29	69	May 1952	45	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	22,186	422,465	281,510
Carthage	Leake Co. Mem.	do	New	50	50	September 1951	25	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	24,784	528,520	166,640
Centerville	Field Mem.	do	do	50	50	March 1952	61	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	14,807	507,201	331,334
Clarksdale	Coahoma Co. Hosp.	do	do	100	100	November 1952		N. I. <sup>2</sup>	61,920	1,301,094	809,870
Collins	Covington Co.	do	do	25	25	July 1951	47	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	7,560	220,882	144,338
Columbia	Marion Co. Gen Hosp.	do	do	80	80	October 1950	45	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	28,097	847,974	280,751
DeKalb	Kemper Co. Hosp.	do	do	25	25	September 1950	41	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	7,101	228,611	74,695
Durant	Dist. 2 Comm.	do	do	25	25	December 1950	49	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	6,687	253,924	82,878
Ellisville	Ellisville Mun. Clinic	General and Public Health Clinic	do	8	8	August 1950	83	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	2,788	81,884	26,747
Forest	SE Laekey Mem.	General	do	47	47	September 1951	30	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	19,148	414,890	132,896
Gloster	Gloster Clinic	General and Public Health Clinic	do	4	4			N. I. <sup>2</sup>	1,287	50,029	14,843
Greenwood	Greenwood Leflore	General	Replacement	135	135	April 1952	72	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	88,349	1,771,340	1,157,560
Hattiesburg	Forrest Co.	do	New	100	100	July 1952	50	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	49,306	1,303,781	859,954
Hazlehurst	Hardy Wilson Mem.	do	do	50	50	September 1950	53	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	34,380	692,941	227,585
Laurel	Jones Co.	do	do	105	105	February 1952	39	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	43,014	1,188,725	775,817
Leakesville	Greene Co.	do	do	25	25	October 1950	13	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	12,425	235,619	77,990
Lexington	Holmes Co. Comm.	do	Additional	16	41	February 1952	37	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	11,340	216,487	144,228
Lucedale	George Co.	do	New	30	30	September 1950	38	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	8,386	272,217	88,105
Macon	Moxabee Co. Comm.	do	do	40	40	March 1952	43	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	29,994	622,943	406,962
Meadville	Franklin Co. Mem. Hosp.	do	do	30	30	February 1951	40	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	7,553	269,537	87,790
Meridian	East Miss. Mental.	Mental	do	260	260	March 1952	92	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	88,141	1,588,152	1,058,768
Okolona	Okolona	General	do	25	25	November 1952	11	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	6,349	246,540	161,927
Port Gibson	Claiborne Co.	do	do	25	25	January 1952	31	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	11,600	245,000	160,500
Prentiss	Jefferson Davis Co.	do	do	26	26	November 1950	93	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	7,800	223,730	72,843
Rolling Fork	Sharkey Issaquena Comm.	do	do	22	22	February 1951	29	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	8,505	192,111	62,120
Ruleville	No. Sunflower Co.	do	do	31	31	October 1950	92	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	15,908	417,287	137,929
Sanatorium	TB Infirm. for Negroes	TB	Addition and remodeling	154	619	April 1952	65	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	53,532	1,753,115	584,372
Starkville	Felix Long Mem.	General	New	40	40	December 1950	63	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	13,493	415,106	128,463
Tunica	Tunica Co.	do	do	25	25	November 1950	47	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	6,918	228,027	73,406
Tupelo	No. Miss. Comm.	do	Addition and remodeling	48	94	January 1951	80	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	1,500	297,674	197,522
Waynesboro	Wayne Co.	do	New	25	25	April 1951	40	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	9,694	213,618	139,506
Wiggins	Stone Co.	do	do	20	20	July 1951	27	S. A. <sup>2</sup>	5,081	174,623	112,615

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Aiken	Aiken Co.	General	Additional	50	113	October 1950	60	S. P.	\$15,263	\$482,676	\$150,626
Bamberg	Bamberg Co. Mem.	do	New	32	32	September 1952		N. I. <sup>2</sup>	13,680	514,168	334,170
Bishopville	Lee Co. Gen.	do	do	43	43	February 1952		N. I. <sup>2</sup>	16,274	537,424	295,553
Chester	Chester Co.	do	do	74	74	July 1952		N. I. <sup>2</sup>	35,924	941,368	468,827
Columbia	Good Samaritan Waverly	do	do	42	42	September 1952		N. I. <sup>2</sup>	5,815	229,649	134,302
Do	S. C. State Hosp.	Mental	Remodeling	(10)	1,673	June 1952		N. I. <sup>2</sup>	5,270	60,840	20,280
Do	do	do	Additional	(10)					3,381	72,023	24,008
Do	do	do	New	(10)					7,634	215,870	71,975
Do	do	do	Additional	(10)					5,005	132,457	79,475
Columbia	S. C. State	do	do	50	1,709	June 1952		N. I. <sup>2</sup>	6,149	174,299	104,580
Fairfax	Allendale Co.	General	New	(11)					58,984	32,441	
Florence	Flor Darlington TB San.	TB	do	118	118	April 1950	44	S. P.	27,040	854,508	448,617
Georgetown	Georgetown Co. Mem.	General	do	52	52	August 1952		N. I. <sup>2</sup>	25,532	529,954	173,864
Do	Georgetown Co. Mem.	do	Additional	(12)	50	March 1950	77	R. O.	2,054	60,472	33,259
Greenville	Greenville Gen.	do	do	(10)	547	August 1950	87	S. P.	11,364	342,698	171,350
Greer	Allen Bennett Mem.	do	New	28	28	May 1952		N. I. <sup>2</sup>	15,604	501,860	175,000
Hampton	Hampton Co.	do	do	25	25	November 1950	63	R. O.	9,122	292,124	91,541
Loris	Loris Comm.	do	do	25	25	April 1950	63	R. O.	3,000	165,496	55,165
Manning	Clarendon County	do	do	52	52	April 1951	54	R. O.	18,586	582,129	191,773
Newberry	Newberry Co.	do	Addition and remodeling	38	64	February 1951	45	S. P.	8,609	360,032	120,010
Rock Hill	York Co.	do	do	62	141	December 1949	12	S. P.	26,435	541,103	180,368
Seneca	Oconee Mem.	do	do	40	75	March 1950	64	S. P.	5,038	151,078	50,359
Spartanburg	Spartanburg	do	Addition and remodeling	64	370	March 1951		S. P.	44,589	1,374,650	458,217
Do	Spartanburg Gen.	do	do	(10)					2,828	124,941	62,470
State Park	S. C. Sanatorium	TB	do	(10)	964	March 1951		S. P.	18,248	469,788	156,596
Do	S. C. State Sanatorium	do	do	(10)					2,983	105,504	52,751
Do	do	do	Addition and remodeling	(10)					544	28,575	14,287
Do	do	do	do	(10)							
State Park	S. C. State Hospital	Mental	New	(10)	1,621	December 1951				26,026	13,013
Do	do	do	do	(10)					747	17,585	5,862
Do	do	do	Additional and remodeling	(10)	1,781	February 1949		N. I. <sup>2</sup>		63,080	21,027
Do	do	do	do	(10)							
Do	do	do	do	(10)							
Do	do	do	Additional	240	1,845				25,176	487,284	162,429
Do	do	do	New	(10)					2,829	107,991	35,997
Do	do	do	Additional	(10)	60	October 1950	25	S. P.	4,399	130,027	78,017
Union	Union Co.	General	Addition and remodeling	(10)					18,434	733,715	244,572
Walterboro	Colleton Co.	do	New	101	101	July 1952		N. I. <sup>2</sup>	31,336	1,077,628	669,705

See footnotes at end of table.



## TENNESSEE

Location	Name	Category	Type construction	Beds added	Beds upon completion	Date opened	Percent occupied	Source of information <sup>1</sup>	Architect fees	Total cost	Federal share
Chattanooga	Chattanooga TB	Tuberculosis	New	120	120	October 1951	13	S. P.	\$108,870	\$2,098,360	\$699,453
Cookeville	Cookeville	General	do	49	49	December 1950	45	R. O.	29,449	600,142	189,047
Crossville	Cumberland Med. Ctr.	do	do	50	50	March 1950	47	R. O.	30,930	707,860	235,787
Fayetteville	Lincoln Co.	do	Addition	35	77	June 1950	47	S. P.	25,678	497,409	164,750
Jackson	Jackson and Madison Co.	General and public health clinic	New	128	128	August 1950	77	R. O.	97,901	1,839,628	589,880
Johnson City	Johnson City Mem.	General	Addition	84	152	February 1951	55	S. P.	63,335	1,245,265	408,488
Do	do	do	do	36	178	do			5,220	113,736	59,143
Kingsport	Holston Valley Comm.	do	do	126	240	May 1952		N. I. <sup>9</sup>	80,000	2,100,852	817,002
Knoxville	Eastern State	Mental	do	188	1,538	January 1951	99	S. P.	56,230	1,579,339	421,446
Do	E. Tenn. Crippled Child	Chronic	Additional and remodeling	40	62	June 1951	35	S. P.	24,422	523,864	267,332
Do	E. Tennessee TB	TB	Replacement	180	180	January 1951	74	S. P.	132,834	3,249,422	1,089,229
Lawrenceburg	Lawrence Co.	General and public health clinic	New	50	50	August 1951	40	S. P.	24,402	527,548	172,349
Maryville	Blount	General	Additional and remodeling	62	112	January 1950	83	S. P.	4,346	576,921	192,307
Memphis <sup>8</sup>	W. Tennessee TB	TB	New		400	May 1949	96	S. P.		285,048	95,016
Memphis	LeBonheur Child	Chronic	do	100	100	June 1952		N. I. <sup>9</sup>	116,007	2,195,761	1,104,721
Murfreesboro	Rutherford	General	Additional and remodeling	32	73	July 1952		N. I. <sup>9</sup>	22,750	508,439	235,600
Nashville	Central State	Mental	Additional	( <sup>6</sup> )	2,180	July 1950	94	S. P.		70,000	86,400
Pulaski	Giles Co. Hosp. and HC	General and public health clinic	New	41	41	November 1950	37	R. O.	22,045	414,778	131,826
Ripley	Lauderdale Co.	General	do	55	55	do	45	S. P.	29,248	531,746	172,249
Savannah	Hardin Co.	General and public health clinic	do	50	50	December 1950		N. I. <sup>9</sup>	39,000	797,258	405,158
Sewanee	Emerald Hodgson	General	Remodeled	NH	46	April 1952	47	S. P.	7,323	150,446	78,332
Shelbyville	Bedford Co.	General and public health clinic	New	58	58	April 1951		N. I. <sup>9</sup>	47,471	863,905	438,831
Union City	Obion Co.	General	do	60	60	October 1950	59	R. O.	41,501	760,158	251,310

<sup>1</sup> R. O. indicates latest information on file in regional office Mar. 11, 1953, represents figures at end of calendar year 1952.

N. I. indicates no information available.

S. P. indicates State plan dated July 1952.

S. A. indicates latest information on file with State agency Mar. 12, 1953, and usually represents 12-month period ending Dec. 31, 1952.

<sup>2</sup> Nurses' residence, 100 nurses' beds.

<sup>3</sup> Equipment only.

<sup>4</sup> Pick up.

<sup>5</sup> Pick up, equipment only, fraction.

<sup>6</sup> Equipment.

<sup>7</sup> Laboratory.

<sup>8</sup> Indicates latest information from State agency, Mar. 13, 1953, for month ending Jan. 31, 1953.

<sup>9</sup> N. I. = No information available.

<sup>10</sup> Service facilities.

<sup>11</sup> Equipment only.

<sup>12</sup> Nurses' Home.

Mr. BUSBEY. They talk about the shortage of hospital beds. I do not know who worked out the formula, but it is not one on which there is 100-percent agreement by a long ways. Let me read to you what John J. Bourke, M. D., executive director, New York State Joint Hospital Survey and Planning Commission, of Albany, said:

It is essential, therefore, that a competent, respected organization in the hospital field assume responsibility and leadership immediately for developing a realistic, practical method of estimating the overall hospital-bed requirements for a community, consistent with current philosophies and practices of hospital and medical care.

Here is one from the State of Washington, written by Mr. Ralph L. Nielsen, head, hospital planning and development section, hospital and nursing home pro-

gram, department of health, State of Washington, of Seattle:

There are now 3.6 acute general hospital beds per 1,000 population in use in the State of Washington, and few if any people are being denied accommodations. Under these circumstances, it would seem unrealistic to build an additional 2,000 beds at this time, as would be needed to fulfill the 4.5 ratio. At present, hospitals in some parts of the State are overcrowded, but in other parts of the State, hospitals have low occupancies.

Mr. Ritz E. Heerman, superintendent, the California Hospital of Los Angeles, had the following to say:

In California, we have found that the formulas now in use are not realistic. The theoretical allotment of beds has proved, in general practice, not to be the real need. Many hospitals have been built which are

now 40-percent occupied and have become questionable as to solvency. Other areas, where statistics show that additional beds should be supplied, actually do not have any shortage of beds that can be proved by the percentage of occupancy of existing institutions in the area.

These three quotations were taken from the American Hospital Association Journal.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BUSBEY was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BUSBEY. There has been some talk about this gimmick they cooked up in the Public Health Service which they call split projects. Under this arrangement, a State is permitted to allot sufficient funds to a sponsor to start a hospital, with the understanding that Fed-



eral funds will be allotted in succeeding years to complete construction if sufficient appropriations are made, thus placing Congress in the position of having to continue appropriating funds every year indefinitely or be accused of stopping construction of partially built hospitals.

It is just a gimmick that they put in the regulations and procedures in order to bring this pressure on Congress to keep paying, and paying, and paying.

It may come as a surprise to many, but they have had a hard time selling this program in some communities. They spent \$21,746.19 to make a motion picture to propagandize the people in order to get them interested in this program.

Then there is another important point I would like to make. They establish hospital needs in five categories, but they do not build hospitals in the communities where the greatest need has been established. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following tables in proof of this point:

*Federal share allotted, projects by priority area by fiscal year of approval*

ALABAMA				
	Priority in terms of hospital areas percent of need met			
	0	1-25	25-50	50 and over
1948.....		\$1,353,147		\$1,387,705
1949.....	\$2,982,872	439,241	\$4,781,509	
1950.....	1,145,846			604,361
1951.....	1,759,704		346,987	
1952.....		253,318	375,623	246,612
1953.....	500,000			597,904
Total.....	6,388,422	2,045,706	5,504,119	2,896,582
Grand total.....	16,834,829			

CALIFORNIA				
1948.....	\$491,598	\$1,054,098	\$233,674	\$346,315
1949.....	1,005,177	947,980	416,248	
1950.....	417,937		2,839,756	1,252,420
1951.....		913,282	1,647,328	89,672
1952.....			937,481	554,236
1953.....	96,557	2,076,350		
Total.....	2,011,269	4,991,710	6,074,487	2,242,643
Grand total.....	15,320,109			

COLORADO				
1948.....		\$217,066	\$753,981	
1949 and 1950.....	\$108,392		435,863	\$1,179,254
1951.....		387,764		
1952.....				752,240
1953.....				
Total.....	108,392	604,830	1,189,844	1,931,494
Grand total.....	3,834,360			

GEORGIA				
1948.....	\$507,750		\$2,140,253	\$473,604
1949.....	594,017	\$116,280	1,777,739	
1950.....	198,000	154,318	4,398,371	99,555
1951.....	609,986		1,500,374	460,667
1952.....			2,531,624	95,401
Total.....	1,909,753	270,598	12,348,361	1,129,287
Grand total.....	15,657,999			

MONTANA				
1948.....	\$222,890			\$55,414
1949.....	219,371			111,689
1950.....	208,779		\$155,594	
1951.....	30,903			211,739
1952.....		\$269,632	122,995	
Total.....	681,943	269,632	278,589	378,842
Grand total.....	1,609,006			

SOUTH CAROLINA				
	Priority in terms of hospital areas percent of need met			
	0	1-25	25-50	50 and over
1948.....	\$457,178	\$120,010	\$908,580	\$180,368
1949.....	328,024		581,656	1,999,361
1950.....	1,003,875			747,214
1951.....				5,985,504
1952.....	542,913			39,754
Total.....	2,331,990	120,010	1,490,236	8,952,201
Grand total.....	12,894,437			

TENNESSEE				
1948.....		\$676,144	\$1,231,054	\$600,795
1949.....	\$405,158		673,033	517,063
1950.....			2,522,312	1,002,028
1952.....			1,467,570	223,200
1953.....			52,000	
Total.....	405,158	676,144	5,945,969	2,343,086
Grand total.....	9,370,357			

WASHINGTON				
1948.....	\$214,175			\$431,706
1949.....				467,166
1950.....	508,024		\$299,242	1,050,697
1951.....		\$92,800	634,225	678,460
1952.....				844,400
1953.....				359,000
Total.....	722,199	92,800	933,467	3,831,429
Grand total.....	5,579,895			

The testimony in our hearings shows that over twice as many beds are being built by private enterprise, without any funds from the Federal Government, as are being built under the Hill-Burton program. I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a table which shows this ratio for the last 7 years:

*Hospital construction in the United States, 1947-52*

[In millions of dollars]						
Calendar year	Value of work placed (current prices)					
	Total	Federal	Federally aided		Nonaided	
			Public	Private	Public	Private
1947.....	195	30			(165 total)	
1948.....	349	98	1	2	124	124
1949.....	679	163	49	75	265	127
1950.....	820	146	110	118	220	226
1951.....	913	128	118	128	248	291
1952.....	866	111	106	116	261	272
1953, estimated.....	796	90	102	109	270	225

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Division of Hospital Facilities, May 1, 1953.

I have in my hand a Chicago paper dated April 20 which shows a picture of Mount Sinai Hospital. This is a new \$3.4 million hospital built by the Jewish people of Chicago. This shows what can be done by people who not only believe in themselves, but have the will to do things on their own. They did not ask for any Federal funds. If the people want these hospitals, and they need these hospitals, they will raise the money, and take pride in raising the money themselves, instead of coming to Uncle Sam for handouts.

There was a situation a couple of years ago in the district of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], where they turned down Federal funds. The

Federal Government tried to force funds on this community to build a hospital. The people said, "No, we do not want these funds. We will build our own hospital." And they did it, by everybody contributing so much of the produce from their farms and their personal services. That is the American spirit. That is the spirit that made America great, and that is the spirit that is going to keep America great.

There is a case at Morristown, N. J., where they built one of the most modern and best-equipped hospitals in the entire United States at an average cost of \$9,126 a bed. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] referred to the hospital in Butler, Pa. That was a remodel job. Morristown, N. J., is in a high-cost production area. It is higher, I think, than in Butler, Pa. But after they get through remodeling the old hospital in Butler, and after deducting the \$600,000 for the nurses' home, what do you think will be the result? The final cost of the additional beds in this hospital is going to be somewhere between \$50,000 and \$55,000 a bed. Then I would like to mention briefly Indianapolis Health Center. Here is the plush of all plush jobs. One of the most elaborate buildings with offsets, and setbacks, that you ever saw in your life. The Federal Government's participation in this project amounts to \$1,500,000. A friend of mine said that, by no stretch of the imagination, should it have been over \$200,000. It is so flagrant a case that at this late date, the Federal Government is trying to recoup \$500,000 of the \$1,500,000 that has been previously approved.

I hold in my hand a picture of the building. Here is a window overlooking the swimming pool. What do you think they did? They paid \$4,000 for four drapes for this window overlooking the swimming pool. In this so-called hospital-construction program, they are appropriating money out of the Federal Treasury for many other things besides facilities which add hospital beds. I think this is a program that should be looked into very thoroughly. I am very happy to see my very dear friend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on the floor, because this legislation comes under the jurisdiction of his committee. I hope he will survey it very thoroughly before the act is extended. I am sure he will find that the legislation needs some revision, as well as extension.

One of the investigators for the committee who spent a great deal of time in studying this program, as it is actually being administered, has submitted the following as his opinion regarding the program's deficiencies. With most of these contentions I agree, and I certainly think they are all worth considering in connection with further legislation or appropriations that deal with this program:

The Hill-Burton Act is deficient for the following reasons:

1. It has caused overbuilding of hospital facilities, some of which are in financial difficulties because of low occupancy.



2. It provides a nationwide formula for determining need, to which formula some State administrators have objections.

3. It allows for the building of so-called related facilities without clearly defining such facilities. Administratively, this has been interpreted as allowing for almost any facility—such as religious chapels, space for doctors' private offices, space for welfare agencies, etc.

4. It forces State agencies to locate sponsors in order to spend Federal funds. If these cannot be found in the high priority areas, the State agency continues its search and will grant funds to sponsors in areas with the lowest need.

5. It disregards local conditions and the effect these may have on bed requirements and occupancy thereof.

6. It disregards availability of essential staff, such as nurses and doctors. According to the PHS Division of Nursing Resources, over half of the existing hospitals have vacancies in graduate nurse staffs. All hospitals are said to be short 22,486 nurses, according to the 1952 study of the American Hospital Association.

7. It wastes Federal funds by allowing sponsors to claim reimbursement for lavish equipment which would not be bought if Federal funds were not available.

8. It allows State agencies to define non-acceptable beds for formula purposes. In some instances, beds over normal capacity are classed as nonacceptable, and those in facilities which have design and location limitations are also classed as nonacceptable.

Mr. Chairman, for these very compelling reasons, I trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, in commenting on this bill I want to point out how accelerated medical research is absolutely essential to the solvency of our 48 State governments. Although I am heartily in support of increased research in the fields of cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and disorders of the nervous system, I want to emphasize particularly the vital importance of vastly increased research in the field of mental illness.

The care of the mentally ill today is, in many States, the most crushing single load upon the State budget. There are more than 600,000 mentally ill in our State hospitals, and the aggregate cost of caring for them is in excess of a half a billion dollars annually. More than 200,000 mentally sick persons are admitted to these State hospitals each year, and although the respective State governments have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in the past few years in mental hospital construction, there is still the need for several hundred thousand more beds.

I say to you that many State governments will go bankrupt in the next decade or two if they attempt to care for, but not treat and cure, the increased load of the mentally ill. At present the average stay of a patient in a mental hospital is 8 years and this lengthy stay costs the State \$5,600 per case. This is a back-breaking load upon the taxpayers of the State.

True economy lies in intensive treatment of the mentally ill. This can only be brought about by the training of additional personnel in this field and by a

marked acceleration of research projects to find cures for this disease.

I was a Member of the 80th Congress, which appropriated the first funds under the National Mental Health Act, and I am proud of the fact that it has had a tremendous impact upon the States because of its emphasis upon accelerated research and training. Grants-in-aid to the States and to medical schools and universities have enabled hundreds upon hundreds of desperately needed psychiatrists, psychologists, nurses, and social workers to obtain training. Equally important, more than 300 mental hygiene preventive clinics have received part or all of their support from this program. Finally hundreds of grants have gone to research workers in all parts of the land.

Let me tell you of the benefits of this program to my own State of Louisiana. For decades thousands of mental patients piled up each year at the East Louisiana State Hospital at Jackson and the Central Louisiana State Hospital at Pineville. There was practically no research and no training of native Louisianians to become psychiatrists. With the passage of the National Mental Health Act by the Congress, Tulane University began the development of a training program which had 27 potential psychiatrists in training last year. Your appropriations, gentlemen, were the catalytic agent in this program. Incidentally, as the training program developed and expanded at Tulane many private citizens and organizations became interested, so that at the present time Government support at Tulane constitutes only about 20 percent of the psychiatric budget.

This story had a moving climax just a month ago, when Dr. Robert Gordon Heath, professor and chairman of the department of psychiatry at Tulane, testified before the Appropriations Subcommittee of this body. Dr. Heath told how Louisiana had recently built a new State hospital at Manderville, about 50 miles outside of New Orleans. For a while the hospital was bogged down in the dilemma repeated in almost every other State—a lack of doctors. The director of the Louisiana State Hospital Board recognized that if adequate staff in sufficient numbers was to be obtained he would have to start a training program and construct a research wing on the hospital. Fortunately, the Tulane Medical School training program was just getting on its feet. A working arrangement was developed between Tulane and the new hospital. As a result, this hospital has a large staff of vigorous, young psychiatrists, more than half of whom were able to take training because of fellowships you granted under the National Mental Health Act. These doctors are treating mental illness in its early stages; they are returning people to their homes, and saving the State money.

Now, this is a fine step forward, but there must be many more of these steps if we are to lick the problem. Frankly, for the two main purposes of the National Mental Health Act—research into mental illness and the training of psy-

chiatric personnel to combat it—Congress has never appropriated adequate moneys. I am informed that each year the National Mental Health Advisory Council to the Public Health Service must turn down hundreds of research and training applications from all over the country because of lack of funds.

I am in support of the bill under consideration, but I hope to see a much larger sum in the years to come for medical research against mental illness and its companion scourges, cancer and heart disease.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I must confess I am not too familiar with this program. All I know about it is what I have heard the gentleman on the floor say today.

I know the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is a very conscientious legislator. I know the gentlemen in opposition are conscientious.

Perhaps it is all that you say it is, but there is another problem which to me is infinitely more important than these various programs and activities of the Federal Government.

I do not know what sort of campaign you made, but in my State of Texas I promised the people I would do everything within my power to bring about a balanced budget. People voted for me on that campaign promise. I think 2 million Texans voted for me in the general election, and I assume they intended for me to carry out my campaign promises. President Eisenhower carried the State of Texas by 175,000 votes, and he distinctly promised to restore sound fiscal policies. I am sure the people of Texas heard his speeches over the television and radio and when he appeared in the State. They knew exactly what he was promising. I feel that I have an obligation to do everything I can as an insignificant and humble Member of this body to establish a balanced budget. The only way I know that it can be done is either to reduce expenditures drastically or to increase taxes. I know that you cannot undertake to reduce expenses without running into considerable opposition. In fact, I do not know of a single activity or program of this Government which, if we undertook to curtail it, there would not be champions of that activity who would want to restore it. But the question is, How are you going to finance this Government? You cannot finance it through bonds to individuals, because there are not enough individuals who have enough money left after paying taxes to buy bonds. Furthermore, there are so many people in this country who have already lost half of the purchasing power of their money as a result of buying Government bonds that they are somewhat hesitant about buying them.



Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he has made. A while ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] looked over on the Republican side of the aisle and said, "Now you have got the votes. It is up to you to balance the budget." I thought for a little while perhaps all the Democrats over there, who once in a while used to try to help us get that job done, had all been converted to that philosophy. I am glad to see some evidence that you are not all going along with that philosophy, because, as a matter of fact, the gentleman is entirely correct in the necessity of balancing the budget. I hope as we go along we will not see a complete vote on the Democratic side to increase all amounts, and that the Republicans alone will be compelled to hold the line. We ought to have some help on the Democratic side.

Mr. DIES. As I said, you cannot finance this huge and growing deficit by the sale of bonds to individuals. Then you will be required to sell them to the banks and sell them on the open market. Already your bonds have depreciated. The moment you withdraw Government support of the bonds they begin to go down. Your interest rate will constantly increase, because people are not going to buy bonds at a lower rate of interest than they can make somewhere else. Consequently, we are faced with the tremendous problem of financing our Government debt and deficit spending. Those who are in favor of continuing projects and activities of the Government, without any reduction, ought to have the honesty and the courage to support adequate taxation to balance the budget.

You know, I have had to balance my budget all of my life. When I began to practice law in Marshall, Tex., I had to balance my budget by foregoing many necessary and useful expenditures. My wife had to economize. We lived on about \$75 a month. So when you talk about curtailing expenditures, there is not any place you can curtail them without occasioning some inconvenience and, perhaps, hardship to some people. But we are engaged in a period of prolonged peril; the cold war may continue for a decade or so. No man can foresee the end of the emergency that now confronts the American people. Untold billions of dollars will have to be raised for the purpose of preparing America and safeguarding the free institutions of our country. If we permit the solvency of this Nation to be in doubt, to be in question; if we destroy the confidence of the people in the responsibility of the Congress and of the executive department, how will we be able to meet the responsibilities that we have already voluntarily entered into? I would like for some Member to discuss this question of how we are going to finance this deficit. Can we return to the specious and unsound method of selling pegged bonds to banks and permitting the banks to deposit them in the Federal Reserve banks

on a basis of 6 to 1? This is simply printing credit money; it is a form of dangerous inflation. If you print Government bonds and authorize the Federal Reserve to issue credit money on the strength of the bonds at the ratio of 6 to 1 it, of course, stimulates inflation. Who profits by inflation? Every speculator in the land, every man who has stock, every man who is wise enough to speculate in property that increases in paper value in proportion to the decrease in the purchasing power of the inflated dollar.

You say you are redistributing the wealth. Why, there are men all over this land who were only moderately wealthy before this inflation program, who had land that was worth only \$20 or \$15 an acre; today that same land could not be bought for \$200 an acre. The men who profit by inflation are not the poor; they are not the middle class—the middle class are liquidated by it, liquidated by inflation on the one hand and crushing taxation on the other. How can my children ever achieve any independence under the tax system of this country? They would have to make a million dollars to save a hundred thousand. We freeze them into their present status for life; we make it forever impossible for men of courage and initiative to achieve any independent status in our country. They become wards of the State, for they have no other security except the security provided by our Federal program.

I submit that what I am saying is not Democratic heresy. When we took power in 1932 I remember distinctly that it was our promise, it was our commitment, that we would operate on a balanced budget.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I claim to be somewhat of an expert on economy because I believe that in the 13 years I have been here I have voted against something like \$130 billion of appropriations with which I disagreed. I want to say that I am regretful that I come here as a member of the party of my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] in support of the pending amendment. I do so because I believe that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce spent more time upon this legislation than any other committee.

It came over to us from the other body. One of the things we were very concerned about and that we saw to in the consideration of that legislation was that the control of this program was largely vested within the States themselves. The States do the selecting of the priorities and the laying down of the principles as to who was to be given the first consideration in the program.

Let me say that in my own State in the course of the last 6 years there have been built 70 hospitals under this program. It is one of the finest programs we have ever had in which the Federal Government has had a part. When this program began in my own State the people familiar with it estimated that we were between 30 and 40 years behind with our hospital program. In the course of the past 6 years not only has this program developed 70 new hospitals but let me say that outside of the program and as a result, perhaps, of the initiative that had been taken, there have been many other hospitals built without any Federal or State support.

In one town in my particular district that I know of when they had voted all the funds that this little community could raise, and they had gotten aid from the State and from the Federal Government, they were still short in the furnishing and the completion of that hospital. The people went out, there was a crusade in that community and they raised by private donation the necessary funds that were needed. When I think that in many communities of my State there were people who were as far away as 50 miles from the nearest hospital, and with all of this fine program that has been built there is still much to be done in that State, as there are in many other States.

That is why I say if the gentleman from Illinois is right, if he is right in his argument, then there should be no funds allocated to this program at all. But I say to you if you are going to have this program mean what it should mean then either give it \$75 million or give it nothing.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman from Illinois was not talking about the basic principle of a hospital-construction program. He was talking about the deficiencies of this program, as it has been, and is being, administered.

(Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and further ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JENN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I only hope that too many Members are not going to start yielding their time to other Members and not use it. At the start of the debate I made my position very clear. I am not going to object to this request, but if there are very many more of them I am going to object to that parliamentary procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?



There was no objection.

#### HILL-BURTON FUNDS

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, in the 6th District of Virginia, which I have the honor to represent, our people are vitally interested in the program sponsored under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, Public Law 725, 79th Congress, popularly known as the Hill-Burton program. This act, authored and sponsored by Senator HILL, of Alabama, and Senator BURTON, of Ohio, was signed by the President on August 13, 1946. The program has enjoyed the approval and endorsement of the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, and many other national and local medical organizations as well as individual medical practitioners.

I recently received from the hospital authority of the city of Lynchburg, the following letter written by the Administrator, Mr. Robert Hudgens:

One of the great expectations for this administration is a lowering of the cost of Government, or at worse a more effective expenditure of public funds. One is therefore quite self-conscious in writing his representatives and requesting them to give consideration to an increase in the appropriation for any specific measure. He can do so only when his conscience and judgment have come under a satisfactory scrutiny.

It is my conviction that nothing after the preservation of our way of life is more important to the individual and Nation than health. Measured in terms of the consequences of its loss to an individual, it ranks above education, wealth, roads, or other rewards within the power of our Government to bestow. Without health the great aims of our preamble "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," are for the individual jeopardized.

It is in this belief that I ask your support of the Hill-Burton program and like measures which provide facilities for health preservation and health recovery. It appears to me that this legislation has a merit and urgency which are exceptional. It was born of a necessity which it is in the process of relieving. Unusually right in design, principle, and purpose, it has awakened people over the Nation to a renewed interest in and acceptance of responsibility for health.

Many areas have been able to obtain facilities for the first time or to replace tragically obsolete and often dangerous ones with modern units and thereby attracted better doctors, nurses, technicians, and trainees to the benefit of all.

With these things I know you are familiar, particularly in Virginia. The achievement in Leesburg, Front Royal, Woodstock, Harrisonburg, Staunton, Amherst, Lovingson, Pearisburg, Abingdon, Cumberland, Dinwiddie, Emporia, Nassawadox, Suffolk, Fredericksburg, Rocky Mount, Danville, South Boston, Farmville, Petersburg, Winchester, and a few smaller projects in Richmond and Roanoke, etc., makes an impressive list.

Because of the great expense of most of these projects they could not have been realized without grants-in-aid. The general rule has been that the local communities have raised 4 percent of the cost locally, and in doing so have often exceeded any single previous fund-raising effort.

With the limitation on public money annually available and under the priority system that as a consequence had to be followed there are numerous other places in the State, as represented by Richmond, Roanoke, Lynchburg, and Bedford, which have raised or arranged for their local share of 45 percent but whose turn has not come and which now face the prospect of not

getting the matching 55 percent from grants-in-aid. Because of the number of approved projects in Virginia which have backlogged, those now under way are assured only 33 1/2 percent of their cost, as opposed to the former, standard 55 percent allowed earlier projects, and even that one-third is conditioned upon Congress continuing the present annual appropriation of \$75 million for the life of the act. Should Congress reduce the appropriation, it follows that the grants-in-aid will be still less and render some of the projects impossible of accomplishment.

Frankly, I do not know the effect of extending the Hill-Burton Act beyond its termination date, but I assume that pending projects will be held up until money has accrued. This further delay after years of waiting will undermine local interest, will discourage the payment of scheduled pledges and perhaps ultimately prevent urgently needed facilities.

A recent communication informs me that Virginia still needs 5,600 more acceptable hospital beds to bring the State up to the accepted ratio of 4.5 beds per 1,000 population.

In view of the dollar shrinkage since the program started, the Federal appropriation should be increased to a minimum of a hundred million, but if this is unrealistic, surely the present appropriation of \$75 million should not be cut, at least until the initial job of bringing the Nation's hospital plant up to date is completed. Once the long neglect is overcome, maintenance by normal replacement of developing obsolescence might offer some relief.

I hope you will find it possible to oppose actively any impairment of this really essential and overdue program.

Sincerely,

ROBERT HUDGENS.

According to information which I have received from the Division of Hospital Facilities, United States Public Health Service, the total estimated cost of this new facility, which is to be erected on a new site, is \$3,501,000. Of the total estimated cost, the total cost applicable to the Federal participation program is \$2,170,620. Of this sum the Federal share was originally 53.39 percent or \$1,156,940, and the share of the applicant is 46.61 percent. This latter figure, plus the difference between the total estimated cost and the total Federal participation cost portion, is \$2,307,159, which figure must be raised locally by the Hospital Authority of the City of Lynchburg. The balance of \$36,900 is payable out of State funds.

I am advised by Mr. James R. Caskie, who did a most commendable job as chairman of the local solicitation drive, that the authority has already raised, by valid subscriptions, \$1,500,000.

In the city of Roanoke, also within my district, we have another project estimated to cost a total of \$2,887,000, of which sum the Federal Government would pay \$954,038, the State government \$30,428, and the local hospital \$1,902,533. All of these figures have been supplied to me by the Division of Hospital Facilities, United States Public Health Service.

The current hospital bed shortage ranges between 733,000 and 850,000 beds. Our population is currently increasing at the rate of about two million per year. The Hill-Burton Act offers the only workable solution to this grave national problem yet presented. It exemplifies the ultimate in the principle of

Federal, State and local partnership, and in the crucial field of national health, upon which our national security so greatly depends. This program is deserving of our wholehearted support. Naturally, we look forward to the day when our hospital facilities will be so improved and so well staffed that our States and localities will not have to look further to the Federal Government for help. Until that day arrives, this three-way partnership should be strengthened and maintained. More particularly is that true in view of the fact that our localities, in good faith, have relied upon a continuation of adequate appropriations and have, by public solicitation, already subscribed the major portion of their partnership share. Since fiscal year 1948, the annual appropriation has not been less than \$75 million and in three of these years exceeded that figure. If the Congress cuts the administration's appropriation request from \$75 million to \$50 million, it will mean that the share of the State of Virginia will be reduced from \$2,219,346 to \$1,464,322, in which event, the State of Virginia may have to completely abandon one of its projects or, in any case, seriously curtail all of them. If the request for appropriations is reduced to \$60 million, Virginia's share would be reduced to \$1,767,363, which might enable us to consummate existing programs but would deprive us of the possibility of the addition of another much-needed project.

In view of the current world situation and the likelihood of increased need for hospital care, I deem it a false and unrealistic economy to cut the appropriation requested by the administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, before the war, in the late thirties, as a member of the National Association of Cost Accountants, meeting in New York periodically, it was, of course, a great pleasure to hear talk somewhat like the talk that one hears here today. However, I will say, in fairness to the members of the National Association of Cost Accountants, they did not fail to include talk of income or product in their talk on cost reduction; significantly, there is no talk in this House today, nor have I heard any on either side of the aisle, on the gross national product which means, generally, on our yearly wealth as a team, all hands aboard. Some hold that our economy is humming and that our production is going up and up, hence, why talk of national product? Has any corporation head worth his salt ever put out a report to stockholders in which the gross wealth of the firm was omitted? Why should we omit talk of gross national product? Let us keep an open eye on the whole picture—let us legislate according to the needs of all concerned; the pressures, created to fill these needs will spark American ingenuity in all ranks as the pioneers were sparked. When the President left office last January, he said he thought within 10 years, if we kept our economy humming, our gross national product would be up



around the \$500 billion mark. He left office when it was \$300 billion.

On what basis are you going to balance the budget? The crying towel? Or on being bold, daring and forceful; on broadening the tax base? On spinning the fly-wheel of ingenuity? Maybe, like the National Association of Cost Accountants, we can do it by making an analysis of all needs and factors.

I am for this amendment; it is a good thing. New Jersey can use its help. More and more of the aged and more and more of the unborn will benefit from its operation, not to mention those now running life's race who might drop in their tracks any day from unforeseen maladies, needing hospitalization. I wonder what the debates in the Spanish Parliament, or whatever it was called, were in 1491, before Columbus asked Isabella for money to go to America.

Balance the budget? On what? Anticipated diminution of human needs? Anticipated lower standard of living? Years ago, 400,000 Indians in this country fought and slaughtered each other for hunting grounds; today, over 158 million Americans are getting along where 400,000 Indians could not.

Where there is a will, we are told, there is a way; let us will to solve human needs; the ingenuity needed will propel us to greater happiness. The amendment should be adopted.

(Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. I submit that most of the arguments presented here today in opposition to this amendment could more appropriately have been made in 1945 or 1950 when the original Hill-Burton Act was under consideration or the amendments to that act were under consideration. That is now the law of the land. The Federal Government has said to the States and local communities, "We will participate in this hospital construction program." The question presented here today is, what is the right amount to provide for that program? The Hill-Burton Act itself authorizes \$150 million. This amendment would provide for only half that amount.

I invite attention to a letter dated May 6, 1953, received by me from Dr. R. H. Hutcheson, commissioner of public health of the State of Tennessee, from which I will quote:

I was much surprised to see in the Nashville Banner last week a statement evidently released from the regional office of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department in Atlanta, to the effect that the proposed reduction in the Hill-Burton funds would not affect Tennessee because, as the paper stated, Tennessee had not used all of its 1952-53 allocation of Federal funds. In fact, the paper went on to say that only approximately \$900,000 of the \$2,600,000 had been obligated. There is nothing further from the real facts in the case because Tennessee has allotted every cent of the money that is available to us from the 1952-53 appropriation except a small amount that has

been held out for reserve to take care of necessary change orders and this reserve is not as large as that recommended by the Service.

Then there is this significant statement:

In Dyer County we have authorized the construction of a hospital with 83 beds at a total cost in Federal participation of \$733,720. Architects have been working on the job for over 6 months. It is not under contract and for that reason was not included in the report that the Public Health Service gave the Budget Committee. The money, however, had been allocated to Tennessee and so far as Tennessee is concerned, it is obligated and Dyer County will expect to receive that sum. None of that money appropriated in previous years will be available for allocation beginning July 1, and any reduction means that the construction program in the future will be reduced proportionately.

This amendment is fair and is based upon the essential elements of justice and equity. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the time the Hill-Burton Act became law and as one who participated in the writing of the act, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

We have heard a great deal of interesting debate on the importance of balancing the budget, reduction of taxes, and the fiscal affairs of the Nation, all with which I am in sympathy. We have heard mention of the fact that Democrats should join in some of these proposed appropriation reductions. I should like to say to the House that it is well known on many occasions I have voted to reduce appropriations. I have voted for economy. In fact, this is one of the programs in which I joined Members of the House 3 years ago and since in reducing the appropriations by one-half.

The question is where are we going to spend the money—the taxes that we are taking in? Where are you going to allocate it? That is the responsibility of the Congress. We received a budget request this year for foreign aid of more than the amount of money this Congress appropriated for that program a year ago.

Now, just a moment with reference to this program. In 1945, it became a law by bipartisan action. The Senator from Alabama, Senator HILL, and the Senator from Ohio, Senator Burton, now a member of the Supreme Court, and the gentleman from Tennessee, a member of our committee [Mr. PRIEST], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who at that time was a member of the committee, were the original sponsors and directed this program through the House of Representatives and through the Congress. It was adopted, as I recall, without a dissenting vote. It provided an authorization of \$75 million.

In 1949, 2 years prior to the expiration date, the Congress saw in its wisdom and

judgment the necessity of extending the program in order that the States' plans be carried out. We provided for State planning. Those plans have been made. They cannot be carried out in 2 years, 5 years, or even 7 years, but yet in 1950, after the Korean war, it became necessary to reduce expenditures to take care of the obligations. What did we do? We reduced this hospitalization construction program by one-half. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, and members of this committee, the chairman and the members of the Committee on Appropriations, what other program, what other program of the Federal Government has been reduced to the extent of this hospital construction program? I say not one, and for that reason, and because of the obligations and commitments already made, this amendment should prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. I feel that the hospital construction program is one of the soundest programs carried on by our Government. I want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the Congress for what this program has meant to my district. My district, semirural, is composed of 12 counties. Under this hospital program three 100-bed hospitals, two 50-bed hospitals, and two health clinics have been erected.

The gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the committee, indicated that he proposed to place in the RECORD the names of certain hospitals where the occupancy ratio is very low. I would like to direct this question to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. Is it not true that in the smaller bed hospitals, in those hospitals with 50 beds or less, it is more difficult to keep them full than in a larger hospital because individuals suffering with serious ailments are not going to these more or less rural hospitals?

Mr. FOGARTY. It certainly is and the doctors testified before our committee to that effect, and also that when these health centers or hospitals were built in a new district, it takes time to get the people and the doctors acquainted with the hospital facilities.

Mr. DEANE. Right at that point, I direct the committee's attention to page 772 of the hearing—and I do not know whether this is the information that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] intends to place in the RECORD concerning vacancy ratio. The following States are listed: Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee. In those particular States, the occupancy ratio is perhaps lower than in some other places. I have gone to the trouble of checking with reference to the State of Alabama. Two of the hospitals were occupied in 1949, five in 1950, nine in 1951, and five in 1952. I contend, Mr. Chairman, it takes time for these hospitals to season.

We are beginning to reach the point in view of this hospital program to enlist and train technicians and nurses which is so critical today and especially



in rural areas. But we are not going to whip this hospital personnel problem if we do not give our strong support to the rural aspect of this hospital program.

There is one other factor which has not been brought out. This is the cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and the various States and local communities. And is this not likewise true, I ask the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] that various counties and political units are levying taxes to enable this program to the extent that is necessary?

Mr. FOGARTY. And issue bonds. This is a State program. The States decide where these hospitals are going to be located.

Mr. DEANE. I quote the following from Dr. Cronin, and I join with the other members in commending him for the splendid job he is doing:

I think the Hill-Burton program, at least in my experience with it, which is now approximately 4 years, is a demonstration of how the Federal Government, the local community, and the State can get together in a cooperative endeavor to accomplish something which many areas of the country are unable to accomplish for themselves by themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and to express my deep appreciation to him for offering this amendment.

As my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. HARRIS] said a few moments ago, I was chairman of a subcommittee of that committee when the original legislation was passed. The ranking Republican member of that committee was the very distinguished and able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. We worked on this bill in subcommittee for many, many days, and we reported to the entire committee. And in executive session we went over the bill word for word and phrase for phrase.

I want to emphasize this fact, although it has been mentioned heretofore, but one of the main objectives of the subcommittee and of the committee in drafting this legislation, and in presenting it to the House for adoption, was to place the responsibility for its administration at the State level. We did that, insofar as legislative language was possible. We required that a State agency, the Commissioner of Health, or some agency of State government, develop a plan for the location of the hospitals in the best possible manner to serve the needs of the people in each individual State. We emphasized that particular part of the entire program. That has been done. It is my judgment that there is no grant-in-aid program in existence today that has had finer cooperation from the local communities, from the States, and the Federal Government than this hospital construction program.

Mr. Chairman, in 3½ minutes I cannot discuss the many angles of this legislation which I would like to discuss. Most of it has been touched upon somewhat already. I want to point out one or two particularly with reference to the rural areas of our country.

My own committee 6 or 8 years ago made a study of the placement of doctors and nurses, particularly in our rural areas, where there has been rather an acute shortage for a great many years. We found as a result of that study that most of the doctors and nurses were going to the larger centers of population because of hospital facilities there, and the people in the smaller rural communities, county seats if you will, were being denied the proper number per capita of doctors and nurses to take care of the health needs of those areas. After a few years of operation under the Hospital Construction Act, that has resulted in small health clinics of 12 beds up to larger hospitals, we found that there has been a reversal of that trend and doctors and nurses are going back to the smaller hospitals to give there a service so greatly needed by the people.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

(Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] is recognized.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am very conscious of the urgent need for balancing our budget at the earliest possible moment, and to do so, I realize the necessity of cutting expenditures wherever it can be done safely. At the same time, I am aware that the task faced by the members of the Appropriations Committee and the members of this Congress is a most difficult one, and I would like to commend the Members on both sides of the aisle for the sincere effort that is being made to reduce expenditures. By my votes, I have made an earnest attempt to economize wherever I thought it advisable, and I shall continue to do so. Yet, there are certain recommended reductions for which I feel I cannot vote.

The reduction to \$50 million of the appropriation for the hospital construction program falls within that category. I am therefore supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island, and I would like to give my reasons for doing so.

The hospital construction program was adopted in 1945 for a 5-year period by the House of Representatives on a nonpartisan basis. It is my understanding that not one single vote was cast against the original bill in the House.

In 1949 this program was not only extended for another 5 years, but the authorization was increased from \$75 million to \$150 million. This was again done without a dissenting vote on either side of the aisle. Certainly a program that is passed by this House without a dissenting vote must have a great deal of merit. This program will expire in 1955

unless further extended. Already the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has introduced a bill extending it another 5 years. Senators HILL and TART, in another nonpartisan move, have suggested the same amendment in the Senate. I understand a Senate subcommittee has already approved a 2-year extension of the program. The hospital construction has been recognized by Republicans and Democrats alike as one that has and will continue to assist in providing critically needed medical facilities for every State in the Union.

This hospital construction program first made funds available to each State to survey the State's health facilities and needs for additional facilities. State officials themselves conducted this survey. When the surveys were completed, the Federal Government began to allot assistance funds to those communities in the order of needs previously established by the surveys. The assistance given is granted on a matching basis—the Federal Government matches the local funds. The program provides that upon completion of the facility, the local community is in complete control of the hospital or health center, and responsible for its operation. No Federal funds are provided for maintenance operation. And, most important, no Federal supervision or authority exists in any way upon completion of the building. So, we can readily see that the Federal Government's role in the hospital construction program is one of assistance and not of control.

The Alabama Congressional District which I represent is predominantly a rural district. Many rural communities have found themselves not only without hospital facilities but, even worse, without a doctor. Most young doctors have been reluctant to go into communities where adequate facilities were not available for the practice of the type medicine they have studied. This is, of course, understandable. A number of communities in my district and throughout my State have built under the hospital construction program the kind of facilities that young specialized doctors require. This has assisted in attracting doctors to many of these areas. Other communities are anxious to participate in this program, and will do so if adequate funds are made available.

I would like to emphasize at this point that, of the new facilities constructed under the program, 59 percent are in communities of 5,000 or less population, and only 7 percent are located in cities which exceed 50,000. On the other hand, the program has not lost sight of the needs of larger institutions in their vital roles of training specialized hospital personnel who will eventually join the staffs of the small hospitals. Nearly \$91 million of the total Federal funds made available to date are being utilized for teaching hospitals which offer internship and residency training.

Over \$23 million of the funds have been allocated to 21 university medical centers in 18 States. In my own State of Alabama nearly a half million dollars has been allocated under this program



to the University of Alabama Medical Center.

Although a great part of the funds are being used by rural communities, we must remember that these rural facilities could serve well as evacuation points for urban areas if war or other chaos should come to this country.

As of January 1, 1953, 1,980 hospital and medical center projects have been approved. Over half of these are already completed and are rendering great services to the communities. About 700 more are presently under construction. Plans are underway for the remaining projects.

Because of these projects, our health resources are being increased by 96,500 hospital beds and over 330 public health centers and other medical facilities. It is certainly a reassuring feeling to note that 430 communities now have hospitals for the first time. Another 150 communities have been able to do away with substandard facilities and bring their medical centers up to modern requirements.

From these statistics, we can conclude that amazing progress has been made since the hospital construction program has been in operation. Yet, according to public health reports, 850,000 more hospital beds are needed in the immediate future. The only possible way to reduce this figure under present conditions is to assume that the probable availability of Federal hospital beds to civilians, such as those of the Veterans' Administration, will decrease this need by about 117,000. This still leaves a deficiency of 733,000 hospital beds. To me, such a deficiency is alarming and, in my opinion, it would be unwise to reduce the funds for this program below the \$75 million mark for fiscal year 1954. I do not feel this request is unreasonable since the hospital program law permits an annual appropriation up to \$150 million. I hope the committee will see fit to support the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

(Mr. MOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, my State has just recently completed a study of this program which builds a strong case for the continuation of the program and for the need of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The study, prepared by the California State Department of Public Health, explains the development of the hospital construction program in California since 1946 when the Hill-Burton Act became effective. In California, the report points out, there is extreme need for new hospital facilities because the State's population increased by more than 1 million persons between 1946 and 1952. By 1960, the report estimates, the population increase will be more than 4 million persons and the need for hospital facilities will increase proportionately.

Since the Hill-Burton Act became effective in 1946, California has constructed hospital space for 21,000 beds. There are now 85,000 hospital beds in

operation or space for the beds is under construction in California. This still is only two-thirds of the State's needs. In spite of the hospital space constructed since 1946, the report states, "the shortage of hospital service is nearly as acute now as it was in 1946." This is particularly true in areas which have experienced phenomenal population growth.

The report estimates nearly 6½ million Californians still have less than three-quarters of their estimated general hospital bed needs. The need for space in mental, chronic disease, tuberculosis, and general hospitals in California by 1960 is estimated at an additional 82,857 beds. The current need for hospital space is indicated by the 118 applications for assistance in hospital and health facility construction pending last January. To meet the health needs, projects costing an estimated \$83,600,000 would have to be built and the Federal share would be some \$26,900,000.

At last November's election, California voters approved a plan to bring the State construction program into line with Federal regulations. State funds now can be made available to nonprofit hospitals on the same basis as Federal funds and the State of California is doing everything possible to carry its share of the hospital construction burden. The Federal Government should do no less than its share, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will provide money necessary to help do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia, [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I join in the apparent universal plea of my colleagues in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island. My State of West Virginia, due to the hazardous occupation of mining, has probably greater need for hospital facilities than some of the other States. Let me remind my colleagues that in World War II between Pearl Harbor and V-J Day there were 125,000 miners working in the mines. One hundred and twenty-seven thousand West Virginians served in the armed services. More men were killed and injured in the mines of West Virginia than there were deaths and injuries amongst a similar number of West Virginians engaged in a world war.

So serious has the situation become in West Virginia that despite the fact that we have erected 11 hospitals under this program—so serious is the situation that the United Mine Workers are building four large hospitals out of their welfare funds in order to take up the slack—due to the fact that we do not have the facilities available in the mining sections of the State of West Virginia.

This is an excellent program; it is one in which you have local participation, one in which you have State participation, and one that is appreciated by the people because they can see the great good that is resulting from this program.

I sincerely hope that the amount asked by the gentleman from Rhode

Island will be restored to this appropriation.

[Mr. MILLER of Kansas addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. MILLER of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

(Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fogarty amendment.

This program has been criticized on the ground that these hospitals are built where they are not needed. That certainly is not true in the State of Georgia for there the people who administer this program in the State will not approve a hospital where there are ample beds already available. The program has been administered well and strictly in accordance with its regulations and the law.

Another criticism is that this program is spending too much of the money in rural areas.

As a matter of fact, both of these complaints are the very strongest arguments in favor of the program. You refer to socialized medicine and you fight it, and I do, too. I do not approve of socialized medicine. I am unalterably opposed to it. But this program is doing more to bring the necessary medical care and treatment to the people of the rural areas than any other program could possibly do. And this all tends to lessen the demands for socialized medicine or compulsory health insurance. As the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] has said, the young doctors are not attracted to the rural areas whereas formerly they did not want to practice in those areas because they did not have hospital equipment and the people were obliged to travel 25, 50, and sometimes 75 miles in order to get adequate hospital and medical treatment. This program is building hospitals in those areas where they are most needed.

It is rather amusing to have the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] call upon us on this side of the aisle to again pull his chestnuts out of the fire. We have done that all through this session. If it had not been for those of us on this side of the aisle, where would your President's program be right now? You know, there are two sides to balancing the budget. Your President has said he cannot balance it this year, he admits he cannot balance it the next year and that possibly he cannot balance it even the third year. He has asked you folks over there now to extend some of the taxes that are about to expire. If you cannot balance the budget by cutting appropriations, you can help him toward a balanced budget by continuing the taxes which soon will expire. You expect us to pull your chestnuts out of the fire on your tax program, and we are going to do it, I suppose for we seem to be just that simple. But I am going to tell you that I am not going to pull your chestnuts out of the fire and make these paltry cuts at the expense of our school children or the



ill people of our country and I am not going to do it at the expense of our national security.

It looks like your man Wilson is trying to out-Johnson Louis Johnson. I was one of the first to call for the resignation of Mr. Johnson, and he was of my own party. Because he put so-called and false economy above our national security since has proven how right I was. I am not yet calling for Mr. Wilson's resignation, but it is coming pretty quickly if he goes on as he is now in his threat to cripple our air program. I am not going along with you on that; I am not going along with you to cripple our atomic energy program and I am not going to economize at the expense of our school children, the aged, the ill, and our national security.

Count on me for my support of your President in matters of true economy and a balanced budget. But not for even his suggestions on programs where he recommends false economy or economy that will cripple our Air Force or atomic energy development. These are our first and last lines of defense.

(Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, whatever other differences may exist among us, no one will deny that the functions and services of the Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments directly affect the fundamental resources of the people of this country. Outside of moral and spiritual strength, no attributes are more vital to national security and progress than the promotion of good health, the advancement of sound education and the encouragement of peaceful labor-management relations in this Nation.

When we speak of "forcing" economies in connection with such obviously important subjects and services it is eminently wise to approach the task with the understanding mind and sympathetic heart of the skilled surgeon who knows he has life and destiny in his hands. Let me remind you that in acting upon the appropriations for these essential departments of Government we are dealing with the lives of our people and the destiny of this country in a most delicate sense.

You Members here know I have been and am now a consistent advocate of Federal expenditure reductions, and voted accordingly, whenever the absolute need of requested appropriations could not be demonstrated by the various department officials. Careful and prudent elimination of Federal waste, extravagance and nonessential spending is the objective of us all. God knows, and, without any irreverence, may I say we know our overburdened taxpayers and harassed businesses can stand that. However, let me exhort you not to let the mere cry of "economy" become a catchword instead of a patriotic watchword.

Mr. Chairman, the President has repeatedly stated that to every act of his administration he would apply the testing question, "Is this good for all America?" I do not know of a better yard-

stick by which to measure safe and sane economy proposals. I earnestly suggest that in our judgments on this appropriation bill we adopt the sincere, common-sense attitude of Presidential example:

Is it good for all America to practically eliminate further construction authorized under the Hill-Burton hospital program? These funds are used to help States and communities defray part of the costs to erect hospitals and public-health centers; they are granted on the basis of population and economic need. These projects are adding 96,500 hospital beds and over 330 public-health centers to the Nation's health resources. Under this program 430 communities now have hospitals for the first time. One hundred and fifty-one other communities now have hospitals where their previous facilities were substandard and unacceptable under the minimum laws of fire and life safety.

Modern and efficient hospitals constructed under the Hill-Burton Act have not only retained physicians in rural localities where there have been great shortages, but also have attracted additional doctors. The proposed cut in Hill-Burton funds means that each State will get one-third less next year to help them build hospitals already under way or in the planning stage. In too many instances the loss of Federal contributions means the particular community will abandon the idea of a hospital entirely because they do not have enough money to complete it on their own. If there is any Federal program that has proved its worth to the American people it surely is the hospital-construction program.

Other impractical reductions set forth in this bill would disastrously impair such essential public health services as pure food and drug enforcement, control of communicable diseases, and cancer and polio research, to mention only a few. Is that good for all Americans?

In the areas of education the proposed cuts would seriously disrupt Federal assistance to the State activities and agencies carrying out vocational guidance in teaching distributive occupations, giving aid to schools in crowded defense localities, extending vocational rehabilitation to disabled veterans and the physically handicapped. The admittedly competent Federal Commissioner of Education resigned rather than attempt to fulfill the obligations of his office, which would be virtually impossible with the ridiculous budget offered him. He questioned the wisdom of saving "such small sums while we continue as a Nation to spend billions for other purposes."

In the Labor Department and the independent labor agencies the reductions advocated in this measure would paralyze the proper functioning of such important Government divisions as the National Labor Relations Board, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the Railroad Retirement Board; divisions which have splendid records of achievement in public service and promoting harmonious management-labor relations. Other agencies

whose vital work in the public interest and welfare would be practically destroyed if these cuts stand approved are, the Women's Bureau to protect women from exploitation, the Bureau of Veterans Reemployment Rights, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bureau of Employment Security, Workmen's Compensation Bureau and the Wage and Hour Division of Labor.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when we are generously granting billions of dollars to aid our foreign allies is it wise to neglect our own citizens? At a time when we are boasting to the world of our better way of life, as opposed to the Communist state, is it intelligent to dangerously retract so many public services whose contributions to national progress have been acknowledged? At a time when we are engaged in a bitter struggle for national survival is it practical to disrupt the morale of our own people? I submit it is not.

Economy in its true sense means getting your money's worth for what you can afford to spend. This is still, thank God, the greatest, strongest, and wealthiest country on the globe. We have been obtaining full value for our money from these public services in the national interest and we cannot now afford to abandon the civilized progress made under them. We have been nationally proud of our Christian social gains made under this form of government; let us sensibly maintain them. Let us not tell our people and the world, at this hour of destiny, the United States must go backward instead of forward. Let us exercise economy with the wise scalpel of the true surgeon and not the ax of the bewildered butcher. In the spirit and admonition of the President, let us continue to legislate and appropriate for the good of all America.

(Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the necessity of the appropriations we are discussing here, for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act, has been noted in a telegram I have received from the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan.

As chief executive of the State of Michigan, Governor Williams is naturally interested in this matter, as are the other governors of the several States, I am sure. They are properly alerted to the impairment of hospital construction which will result from a substantial reduction in this appropriation.

I intend to support the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and I am inserting Governor Williams' telegram in the RECORD at this point:

MAY 25, 1953.

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:

Currently planned hospital construction in Newberry, Howell, Munising, Grayling, Caro, Cass City, Hudson, Addison, Alma, Escanaba, Gladstone, Adrian, Mount Clemens, and public-health facilities construction in Washenaw and Oakland Counties will be impaired such the Congress reduce Hill-Burton funds



by one-third. I strongly urge that this afternoon you speak and vote for Representative FOGARTY's amendment to H. R. 5246 restoring Federal appropriations for hospital construction to \$75 million.

I personally attended the dedication of many of the recently completed Michigan community hospitals erected under Hill-Burton funds and have visited almost all of them at one time or another. I am also convinced that the people of Michigan take as much interest, pride, and satisfaction in these hospitals as any other community endeavor. Failure to go forward with a wholehearted Hill-Burton program will strike at a very vital and heartfelt interest of the people of Michigan.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,  
Governor, State of Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, we in South Carolina realized when we were building certain hospitals under the Hill-Burton provisions, that there would come a time when we could not staff all of these hospitals, so our leaders embarked upon a program of building a teaching hospital, comprising 245 beds, to make it possible for one of the oldest medical schools in the South, Charleston, where the South Carolina Medical College is located, to prepare people to staff these hospitals. We embarked upon a program to build a \$9 million hospital. What was that hospital for? That hospital was to assist in the training of physicians, dentists, nurses, laboratory technicians, dietitians, and other hospital personnel, and offered a special priority for that teaching hospital. There was a time when we did not have all of these people in South Carolina. We went to Chicago, to that great city on Lake Michigan, and imported one of the great pathologists of the Nation. He is now dean of the medical college. To my amazement I had a letter from him the other day and he said this, "I read in the newspapers where Mrs. Hobby's request had been spurned by the Committee on Appropriations," and he was alarmed. He told me that the Medical College Hospital now of seven stories, still going up—we in South Carolina are really outbuilding—would have to curtailed because of this shortsighted policy. Now, you know it is not wise to change horses in the middle of the stream unless the other fellow has the best horse. Never do that. We are now faced with the perplexing problem of stopping the building of a hospital after going up seven stories, after my legislature has met the fulfillments of the intendments of the statute, written by us all—HILL, BURTON, PRIEST, BROWN of Ohio, and others—because of this policy. I say to you that we have appropriated \$39 million for aid in Europe and Asia and throughout the world since World War II. When this Congress will have recessed or adjourned we will have appropriated about \$45 billion for aid across the seas. Now, you know that is a powerful lot of money. Let us appropriate \$75 million to take care of the sick people of this Nation. I have no misgivings about that. My dollar is hurt just as much as yours when we have inflation. We pay our bills, but we are compelled to face facts. As the gentle-

man from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] said, we cut this program from \$150 million to \$75 million because of this so-called police action in Korea. Let us be sensible here and do the right thing and take care of our aged and sick and fulfill the commitments of our States, and then you will be doing the right thing.

#### HOSPITAL SURVEY AND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM IN SOUTH CAROLINA

In accordance with the provisions of the Hospital Survey and Construction—Hill-Burton—Act, the total Federal funds appropriated by the Congress each year is allotted to the States on the basis of a statutory formula. The controlling factors in this formula are the population and the per-capita income within the State. The State is required by law to prepare a State plan, to revise it and submit it annually to the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service for approval. This State plan is based on the States' survey and appraisal of the hospital service needs of the people of the State and the existing resources in hospitals and related health facilities. It also includes the construction schedule which is based on the requirements of the act that the Federal funds allotted to the States must go first to the areas of greatest unmet bed need. The State plans recognizing the need for assigning in the training of physicians, nurses, laboratory and X-ray technicians, dieticians, and other professional health personnel, have often permitted a special priority for teaching institutions. This action is sound because it is essential to have the supply of trained health personnel consistent with the demand for their services which come from the small hospitals throughout the State. It is in the teaching center hospitals that these health personnel acquire the practical aspect of their professional training and round out their many years of academic training.

The Hill-Burton program throughout the Nation is assisting not only in getting needed hospital services to the rural areas, but has also aided in preparing health personnel in these teaching medical centers in helping to assume that this type of personnel will be constantly under training for utilization.

In South Carolina in 6 years of operation of the Hill-Burton program 110 projects have been approved at a total cost of \$32,203,596. The Federal share is \$16,005,406. The State has provided some State funds to help the communities match the Federal funds in these projects.

A total of 2,157 beds have been built in the following categories:

General.....	1,433
Tuberculosis.....	335
Mental.....	300
Chronic.....	29

In addition, approved projects include 8 nurses' homes, with a total of 142 beds; 19 public-health centers; and 45 auxiliary health centers.

The program in South Carolina includes facilities for the curative as well as the preventive aspects of medical care. This is a health maintenance approach and represents our basic need.

The current status as shown by the State plan of South Carolina is as follows:

#### A. Hospitals

Category	Existing acceptable beds	Additional beds needed	Total beds needed	Per-cent of need met
General.....	6,110	3,568	9,678	63
Tuberculosis.....	899	386	1,285	69
Mental.....	3,716	6,764	10,480	35
Chronic.....	195	3,997	4,192	5

#### B. Public-health centers

	Existing acceptable	Programed
Public-health centers.....	26	20
Auxiliary.....	65	178

In the city of Charleston which has long been an outstanding medical center of our Nation the University of South Carolina Medical School Hospital is currently under construction. The estimated total cost is \$9,567,450 and of this the Hill-Burton program has provided \$5,851,202. This 245 bed teaching hospital was phased out from 1951 to 1955 as far as Federal funds and construction is concerned as follows:

Fiscal year 1951.....	\$397,143
Fiscal year 1952.....	1,450,078
Fiscal year 1953.....	1,117,500
Fiscal year 1954.....	1,800,000
Fiscal year 1955.....	1,086,481

<sup>1</sup>The Federal allotment for fiscal years 1954 and 1955 are provisional upon the Congress of the United States appropriating funds for those years.

The Appropriations Committee of the House has reduced the Federal funds for the Hill-Burton program to \$50 million. This is \$25 million below the request of the Truman administration and \$10 million below the request of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

On the basis of \$60 million the 1954 allotment to South Carolina will be \$1,458,276, which will be \$341,724 short of the \$1,800,000 earmarked by the State officials of South Carolina for this university hospital.

If the \$50 million request for this Hill-Burton program is accepted by the House the allotment to South Carolina will be \$1,208,232 and this will be \$591,768 short of the \$1,800,000 earmarked. The State will be confronted with the perplexing problem of how this deficit will be met to assure the continuation of this urgently needed teaching hospital.

It will require a total appropriation in excess of \$75 million for the Hill-Burton program to permit South Carolina to approve any new hospital projects in 1954.

SOUTH CAROLINA BOARD OF HEALTH,  
Columbia, May 5, 1953.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RIVERS: On the 20th day of January 1953, we were notified by the United States Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency that we would have allocated, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1953, the sum of \$1,849,853 for hospital construction.

On the 24th day of April 1953, we received from the Department of Health, Education,



and Welfare information that the allocation for hospital construction had been severely reduced. This was based on the revised budget estimates now pending before the Congress. They informed us that we would have a reduction of \$391,577 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1953 and ending June 30, 1954.

This is a serious interference with the proposal of the State to construct the teaching hospital at the Medical College of South Carolina. This actually means a loss to the college, in the year mentioned, of \$341,724, as most of the funds received in this fiscal year went to the college.

We simply cannot forego construction of the medical college hospital, and we urge and request that you take the matter up with the necessary dispatch, so that the Hill-Burton hospital construction appropriation will not be reduced from \$75 million to \$60 million.

This has been the topic of some publicity in South Carolina being carried on in the newspapers and quoting Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of the authority.

With kindest personal regards.

Very truly yours,

BEN F. WYMAN, M. D.,  
State Health Officer.

MEDICAL COLLEGE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,  
Charleston, S. C., May 4, 1953.  
Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MENDEL: Referring to my telegram of May 2 to you concerning the proposal of the House Appropriations Committee to reduce the hospital construction (Hill-Burton) appropriation from \$75 million to \$60 million, I note in an article from Washington published in local papers that Senator Tarr has taken a strong stand for maintaining this appropriation at its present level. I am sure that you know this and will know much more of what may be done to hold this appropriation at least until hospital construction that has been started in good faith and dependence in it shall be completed.

While it is, of course, true that the allotments made to hospital construction programs were contingent upon appropriations, certainly there is a definite obligation to provide the funds where allotments were actually committed. The Medical College Hospital, now up 7 stories, still has 2 years to run in construction. The machinery for distributing Hill-Burton funds made definite allocations for the construction of this hospital and the State of South Carolina has appropriated over \$2½ million and has made construction contracts involving the entire amount expected from the Federal Government. It is hardly conceivable that after all of this the anticipated Federal funds will not be forthcoming.

Trusting that our alarm may not prove justified, and with many thanks to you, I am

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH M. LYNCH, M. D.,  
President.

(Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. OAKMAN].

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Chairman, it would seem that this raises the question of whether or not the Federal Government should take over the entire hospital situation in this country; whether or not it can afford to take over the hospital situation throughout the country or whether on the other hand, this is going to continue to be a cooperative

program at all levels of government together with all the nongovernmental agencies continuing to work together. In the State of Michigan, when our distinguished colleague [Mr. KNOX] was speaker of the house a short time ago, the people voted to borrow \$65 million and issue bonds to take care of the hospital needs. That is at the State level. In the city of Detroit, for 25 years we needed an extension of our great emergency receiving hospital. Why did we not get it? Because we did not have the money. We completed an annex this year at a cost of three and two-thirds millions, and there is not one Federal dollar in it.

As to the private hospitals, in the city of Detroit, we knew that there were many new hospitals needed and we knew that there were many expansions of existing hospitals and modernization programs needed. How was it done, or was it done? Yes; it is being done. The people of that community went down into their own pockets in the good, old American fashion, not the rich people of the town but all of the people of the town co-operating together, and they brought up \$19,700,000. They are doing the job without one dollar of Federal funds. In spite of all that, I do not think this program should be discontinued. With unexpended balances on February 28 of \$172 million, and \$50 million of fresh money in the 1954 budget, that is probably a great deal more than would be needed in the next fiscal period.

May I say this in conclusion: I am not unmindful of the subject of care for the sick, the indigent, and the decrepit. My father was a doctor of dental surgery, a doctor of medicine, and a Fellow of the American College of Surgeons, and he came up the hard way. In Detroit one of the finest schools for crippled children in the country is named in his honor. I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, we have here an amendment increasing the appropriation \$25 million. This hospital program may have some merit, but how can we afford at this time to be pouring in as much money as we did in prior years, when conditions as to the budget were not so critical and the demands upon the Federal Treasury for expenditure were not nearly so critical? The revised budget on this item is \$60 million. This proposal is \$15 million above the revised budget. I have been in hopes that we would not go beyond the Eisenhower revised budget. We have a great many reasons why we could get along with less.

They say people have issued bonds, and they have to have the money to help out. The primary purpose of this bill was to provide hospital beds, but what have they been doing? They have been allocating enormous sums of money, hundreds of thousands of dollars, for nurses' homes and executive offices. That is not providing hospital beds. That is not the thing that is most urgent in connection with such a program. We should not be spending our money for that.

I have been disappointed that there have been so many cases that have been referred to here where they have low occupancy of the beds in the hospitals. We have a great lot of them in the Veterans' Administration and in the Army and Navy hospitals, and I expect we will in the Air Force hospitals. We have a great lot of it in the Public Health Service hospitals. It has gotten so bad there that they are abandoning a couple of hospitals because they have no real demand for their continuance.

I want to be reasonable about it, and I want to go along on a reasonable figure, but frankly I think the committee figure of \$50 million is as much money as we should be asked to appropriate. We, at some time or other, have to balance the budget. The President of the United States has not said that he could not balance the budget. He has simply said that some of the figures did not indicate that it could be done, but that they were still trying. I hope that this amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 47, noes 57.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BUSBEY and Mr. FOGARTY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 83, noes 87.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: On page 18, line 24, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$60,000,000."

(Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment simply because the Eisenhower administration has recommended this sum of money.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The time was limited on this amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment was disposed of. This is a new amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. There was a time limit on this section of the bill. The gentleman may offer an amendment, but I do not think he is entitled to speak on the amendment under the original agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time was on the amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. And all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair stated, that has been taken care of—the Fogarty amendment and all amendments thereto. This is a new amendment.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, at this late hour I do not intend to take 5



minutes. However, I do think that to those of you who felt that \$75 million was in excess of the amount you wanted to support, this amendment, which carries the recommended amount by the Eisenhower administration, can well be supported.

I want to add 1 or 2 points about this program which has been under the jurisdiction of the legislative committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, over these years and has been handled on a thoroughly nonpartisan basis.

I do not know whether you have had the opportunity to examine the pertinent facts, but there have been 1,980 approved projects all over this country. There are 1,475 general hospitals. Of the nearly 2,000 projects, 1,100 are completed, 700 are under construction, and the remaining are in the planning or drawing board stage. They will add 96,500 beds and over 300 public-health centers and related facilities. Four hundred and thirty communities now have hospitals for the first time; 151 more now have good hospitals where existing ones were substandard. It is very significant that 59 percent of the new facilities are in the communities that have populations of 5,000 or less, and only 7 percent are located in cities which have in excess of 500,000 population.

This, in my judgment, is the answer to the cries for socialized medicine; it is a practical and partial answer to the maldistribution of doctors, nurses, and other personnel.

As far as I know, although there has been a suggestion of some maladministration of this program in some vague instance, there is a general approval of the way in which the program has been handled throughout the country. I think this is attributable largely to the fact that the committee originally and since that time has insisted that the new program should be handled primarily by the State and local authorities where the people themselves have had an opportunity to determine and observe not only the kind of construction but also the administration of this program.

There is now, according to reliable information, something over a 900,000 bed deficit in this country. As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] pointed out, one failure to keep pace with population growth is due largely to the drastic outbreak after Korea.

I suggest that all of us who are interested in balancing the budget and in supporting this administration, should take the advice of this administration in this instance and permit at least this additional amount for the current fiscal year.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the arguments for this amendment on both sides, pro and con, are the same as on the previous amendment just voted on, I wonder if we could not agree on time for debate on this amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a substitute amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 82, noes 58.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY to the amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: Strike out "\$60,000,000" and insert "\$70,000,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall not labor the House with the purpose of my amendment. Everyone here knows that the Fogarty amendment would have provided funds in the amount of \$75 million. The Heselton amendment would provide funds to implement the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act in the amount of \$60 million. The amendment which I have now offered would provide funds in the amount of \$70 million, and I trust it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I had prepared the same amendment as that offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON]. I think that \$60 million is a reasonable middle ground to take on this issue. There is no one here who does not approve this hospital-building program. On the whole it has worked as well as any program we have had in recent years. However, we are in a financial condition in the country where we have got to trim all kinds of good things. I voted against the \$75 million appropriation because I favor this middle-ground figure. The administration to which I belong has looked over the whole matter and has come up with its recommendation of \$60 million.

It seems to me that now when some 1,100 hospitals have already been built under this program the most severely acute needs have been taken care of. We are not in as urgent a situation as when this program was begun 8 years ago. I believe that in line with other cuts, we ought to reduce the original \$75 million estimate to about \$60 million which is the figure that those who have restudied and revised the budget have recommended.

Furthermore, I would say to my friends on this side that I think we can hold \$60 million. If we lose the \$70 million substitute and then the \$60 million amendment and go back to \$50 million, then the motion to recommit will probably include \$75 million and it is likely to pass. I myself will vote for it under those conditions.

So I hope you will reject the amendment to the amendment and accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts for \$60 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

[Mr. SUTTON addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, when this item of \$60 million came before this committee we had no justification for it at all. I do not know what the Bureau of the Budget did with it. We had no hearings on the \$60 million item. The only thing we held hearings on was the \$75 million figure.

It was testified, Mr. Chairman, that we still have in this country, even though this program has been in operation for 8 years, some 800,000 beds less than we need at the present time in our country. It is a question of whether or not you want to do something about getting the beds that are necessary for the people of the country and follow this program through. But I think each of us ought to be man enough to stand up and say whether we are for the program or not, when we are whittling away like this and talking the way we are this afternoon. This is the first time in my memory, in the 8 years that this bill has been law, that the Republican Party has put the Hill-Burton Act into politics. You have put it there by your talk of balancing the budget, and you apparently want to let the people of the country know that you have. Then stand up and be counted then. Tell them that you are for whittling away the Hill-Burton Act. You say that you think they have enough hospital beds in the country to take care of those that need it, when you know that they have not. That is what you are saying in effect today. You are saying that the American Hospital Association does not know what it is talking about. You are telling every other organization that has surveyed this field, worked in this field, that they do not know what they are talking about. I do not know what kind of argument that is.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Do you not feel that there are other organizations in this country that are capable of building hospitals other than the Federal Government, and that that might be the way to build hospitals?

Mr. FOGARTY. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri if it had not been for the Hill-Burton Act during the past 8 years we would have 100,000 beds less than at the present time. If that is your philosophy and the philosophy of the Republican Party, take credit for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to assure the gentleman from Rhode Island, for whom I have the greatest respect and deepest regard, and under whom I had the pleasure of serving for 2 years while he was chairman of this



committee, that I agree with his remarks about standing up and being counted. When we go back into the House and we ask for the rollcalls on these amendments that have increased these appropriations by millions of dollars, I hope every man on the other side of the aisle who stood up and voted for these amendments will stand up and be counted on the roll call.

On the question of a shortage of 800,000 beds, well, that is a matter of opinion. I covered that subject when I spoke on a previous amendment on this item. I am not against the basic philosophy of the Hill-Burton program. But what has happened is this: They have built hospitals without any regard as to the need in the communities or where they were going to get the doctors, nurses, and attendants to staff them.

At the present time, there is a shortage of nearly 23,000 nurses. There is also a shortage of doctors and attendants. I think it is time to stop, look, and listen, and to survey this program very carefully before we go too far and expend funds unnecessarily for hospitals that cannot be staffed and maintained, or that will not be sufficiently utilized to justify their maintenance.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. BUSBEY.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 81, noes 106.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

The question was taken.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HESELTON and Mr. BUSBEY.

The committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 43, noes 67.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the functions of the Public Health Service under the act of August 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), and under sections 321, 322, 324, 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079 of February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of farm products and livestock; and purchase of firearms and ammunition; \$32,500,000, of which \$1 million shall be exclusively available for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy: *Provided*, That when the Public Health Service establishes or operates a health service program for any department or agency, payment for the estimated cost shall be made in advance for deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment at the Clerk's desk in the name of the gentlewoman

from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON]. I offer the amendment at this point.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCGREGOR: On page 19, line 15, after the semicolon, insert the following words: "conducting research on technical nursing standards and furnishing consultative nursing services."

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment at the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON], who, because of official business is out of the city at this time. I have contacted both the minority leader as well as the majority members of the committee, and there is no objection whatsoever to this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, the citation on page 19, lines 10 to 15, does not cover the language that has been omitted, and, therefore, in order to be sure these funds could be spent I would like to move insertion of the words "conducting research on technical nursing standards and furnishing consultative nursing services."

I believe also that this is the appropriate section of the bill for the language to appear.

Mr. Chairman, the expert information derived from research work done by the United States Public Health Service is urgently needed. It provides essential data for the nursing profession for determining both the nursing needs of the Nation and the educational requirements of the nurses who give the service. Very large sums of money are granted for research in the scientific fields, including medicine, but this is the only Federal money that is provided for research in nursing.

Some 30 States have made surveys with the help of the United States Public Health Service, and others are planning to make them. In the State surveys the Public Health Service furnished only the nucleus of expertness that the States do not have. These surveys determine the nursing resources and potentials in the States, including both professional and practical nurses. We can plan for what we need only when we know what we have and no one can question the need of nurses. The type of data furnished by the United States Public Health Service is the kind of material upon which the nursing organizations plan their recruitment and service programs.

The United States Public Health Service has been extremely helpful also in working up plans and procedures for making available nursing services more effective and economical. It is ready to work with nursing organizations on a national basis in initiating a nationwide plan for training of nursing aids who, though now untrained, constitute almost half of the nursing personnel in our hospitals. The Public Health Service works closely with nursing organizations

in the States and Nation. Their activities are planned so that one picks up where the other leaves off.

The United States Public Health Service accumulates data from all the institutions using nurses, both public and private, and acts as a central agency for dissemination of this data. The loss of this service will be felt in all areas of the nursing profession.

The military Nursing Services, Civil Defense, and Public Health Service use the assembled data on nursing resources to aid them in their planning for effective use of available nursepower. Without this service there would exist a gap in nursing studies and research as the nursing organizations depend on the valuable guides furnished.

In conclusion may I say, the nursing problem is big enough and important enough, and affects enough other health activities to warrant a center of activity devoted solely to a solution of the many problems in this field.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the committee deleted this language from the bill because we were satisfied that it was not necessary; that the Public Health Service had authority to do these very things without this particular language. We have no objection to the language going into the bill, although I really think it is superfluous.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the amendment is accepted.

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 19, line 16, strike out "\$32,500,000" and insert "\$34,000,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this is the last amendment I will offer to this bill. This has to do with the public health hospitals of our country. My amendment is \$51,000 less than the so-called Eisenhower revised budget figures.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The information we have on that is that the Eisenhower budget is \$33,551,000, and your figure was \$34 million and something.

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman will listen for just a moment, I think I can explain that, because in the language there was in the original Eisenhower budget \$500,000 for the lepers in Hawaii, and the committee raised that from \$500,000 to make it \$1 million for the lepers in Hawaii. As a result, this amount of \$34 million would leave it \$51,000 less than the Eisenhower budget requested.

In the appropriation, hospitals and medical care, Public Health Service, a total of \$32,500,000 is proposed for fiscal year 1954. This money is to be appropriated to the Public Health Service for the operations of its hospital and medical care program which that organization has so ably administered for so long a period of time stretching back to the beginning of our Republic. On the basis the committee report, the funds avail-



able for this program in fiscal year 1954, including anticipated reimbursements, will drop over \$3½ million below fiscal year 1953, and \$1,551,000 below the revised budget request for direct operations made by the Secretary of the Department. This reduction is being made in the name of economy, but in this case we are using the shibboleth of economy to penalize, if not greatly imperil, the continued operation of medical care program which has become the model among Federal hospital systems for efficiency and economy of operations.

The Public Health Service hospital system has traditionally operated its hospitals with high standards of medical care, with the lowest ratio of hospital employees to patients, the lowest per diem operating cost, and the shortest length of stay. The achievement of this hospital system has recently received recognition in a report prepared for the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs by the General Accounting Office. This is Report No. 36 of that committee submitted on April 15, 1953. In this report the General Accounting Office has made a thorough comparison of the operations of the Public Health Service hospitals with the hospitals of the Veterans' Administration and the voluntary hospitals of the Nation. In the three factors which I have mentioned above, the Public Health Service hospitals show an outstanding record. The ratio of the number of hospital employees to patients for Public Health Service hospitals shown in this report averages 1.26 in comparison with the figure of 1.60 for the Veterans' Administration hospitals and 1.83 for the private nonprofit general hospitals. Similarly, operating costs per patient day for Public Health Service hospitals during the period covered by this report averaged \$14.92 in comparison with \$21.32 for the Veterans' Administration hospitals and \$18.47 for the private general nonprofit hospitals. Even greater credit accrues to the Public Health Service hospitals in comparison with the private nonprofit general hospitals when it is realized that data for the latter hospitals do not include the services and costs of attending physicians, which are included in calculations for Public Health Service hospitals. This record of efficiency and economy established by the Public Health Service hospitals has been achieved through careful and prudent administration of funds which the Congress has made available in the past, coupled with rigorous cutting out of unneeded and inefficient installations.

Since fiscal year 1946 the Public Health Service has closed 10 hospitals in its unceasing efforts to perform the best medical care job with the funds made available to it. At the same time, the Public Health Service medical care programs have kept pace with the tremendous strides in modern medical and hospital practice and have had to face the great demands that the rising economic spiral have made upon the limited resources available for their operation. In the past year this program suffered seriously through the action of the Congress in reducing funds available to the Vet-

erans' Administration to reimburse the Public Health Service for care of veterans in Public Health Service hospitals. This action forced the closure of 4 Public Health Service hospitals and the reduction of staff in the remaining hospitals to a minimum which is barely sufficient to maintain safe care to patients in these hospitals. Employment in these hospitals was cut a total of 800 persons by these actions from March 1952 through February 1953. The program, struggling to recover from this serious blow, was faced with the necessity of further retrenchments under the provisions of the budget submitted by the Secretary to the current Congress. The Secretary's budget, as we were informed by Mrs. Hobby herself in Committee, would eliminate care of veteran patients in Public Health Service general and tuberculosis hospitals, and would require the closure of 2 or 3 additional hospitals and force further economies in an already overburdened activity. The Committee in reporting out the Appropriation bill has proposed that an additional \$1,551,000 be cut from the resources of this program. This reduction will force the closure of 2 or 3 additional hospitals, a total of 4 to 6, and seriously hamper the Public Health Service in its responsibility to provide medical care to the beneficiaries established by law.

The Congress has directed the Public Health Service to provide medical care to the Coast Guard, to Federal employees injured at work, and to seamen on American vessels. All of these groups are vital to the welfare and defense of the United States. A high level of medical care is essential if the Coast Guard is to carry out its manifold functions effectively, and if our shipping is to be operated efficiently. Patients of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation can be treated in Public Health Service hospitals at less cost than in outside hospitals. All of these factors argue for the maintenance of a strong, well-staffed, effective hospital system within the Public Health Service.

At the very least, a reduction of funds for this program in the amount proposed by the committee would force closure of the Public Health Service hospitals at Savannah, Ga., and at Memphis, Tenn., and would seriously cramp the work of the remaining hospitals. Savannah is the only Public Health Service hospital between Norfolk, Va., and New Orleans, La.; Memphis is the only Public Health Service general hospital between New Orleans and Chicago. Loss of these hospitals would make it very difficult for patients in Southeastern and central parts of the United States to get to a hospital when they needed care.

We can hardly expect the Public Health Service to maintain its position as the leading national health organization of the world if we continue to chip away at its very foundations. I ask that the House amend this appropriation bill to restore the operating funds for hospitals stricken from the Secretary's request, amounting to \$1,551,000. I should like to emphasize that if economy is sought, if reduction in Federal expendi-

tures is sought, if more efficient Government operation is sought, it cannot be achieved through penalizing those who have contributed so greatly to these ends in the past in operating their hospitals.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am intensely interested to see this amendment adopted. If it fails it will be necessary to close the Public Health Service Hospital at Memphis, Tenn.

This hospital was first operated as a marine hospital and was opened in 1884, or 69 years ago. This hospital is of red brick construction, on some five acres of ground overlooking the Mississippi River. The present main hospital was constructed during 1935 with a standard bed capacity of 134 patients, along modern principles of construction. The Government has an investment in this institution of slightly more than \$1 million. The newer part of the hospital has been hailed as architecturally outstanding among such units in the country and is equipped with the latest and modern surgical and medical appliances.

Eligible for medical treatment are members of the Coast Guard personnel and their dependents, Federal Government employees injured in the line of duty who become Bureau of Employees' Compensation Commission beneficiaries, Coast and Geodetic Survey personnel and their dependents, Merchant Marine cadets, Public Health field service personnel, cadets of State Maritime Academies, Public Health Commission officials and their dependents, and civilian employees of the Corps of Engineers, as well as merchant seamen.

The traffic on the Mississippi River in the last two decades has increased tremendously, and the movement of grain, fuel, automobiles, steel, wire, and for that matter all classes of commodities, has increased the number of personnel who work on the boats and barges plying the river. This institution operates cheaper than any other nonprivate hospital. During this fiscal year 1953, the operating expenses of the hospital will amount to \$550,000. The major portion of this money, \$432,000 will go for personnel services and the remainder, \$118,000 for services and supplies. In 1952, 1,265 patients were discharged from this small 134-bed institution so efficiently managed and giving the finest surgical and medical care to those admitted. In addition over 36,000 outpatients received medical care. Sixty-one percent of this total number of patients were Bureau of Employees' Compensation cases, wherein the Federal Government had a direct responsibility. These patients were United States Government employees who were injured on the job and for whom medical care had to be provided. Twenty-four percent were American seamen and Coast Guardsmen. These two categories of beneficiaries accounted for 85 percent of the hospital patients in 1952.

The hospital is staffed by 8 doctors and dentists and 20 nurses, and has a total personnel complement of 110 employees.



With all due respect to the committee, I cannot see the wisdom nor economy in closing these two general hospitals at Savannah, Ga., and Memphis, Tenn. That will mean that the average in-patient load of 99 patients per day now being handled at Memphis will have to be transferred to New Orleans, San Francisco, or Norfolk, Va. There will be no service available in the southeastern part of the country, and all qualified for admission for medical services at Memphis from the States of Arkansas, Missouri, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, North Carolina, Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas will have to be transported long distances to the remaining hospitals to which I have referred.

I can see no economy in the removal of those who fall ill, or who are injured up and down that valley, and especially on the rivers where so many seamen work and where we find so many engineer employees. To me the physical risk and expense of removing them to these distant places would be far too great.

Through all its long history the Public Health Hospital in Memphis has been spared partisan political consideration. Republican and Democratic administrations alike have recognized its importance and the fine service it has given, especially to those who work on the river. In these days when all of us are interested in improving the efficiency of Federal services, in reducing waste and extravagance and the cost of those services, I do not see the wisdom in closing a 69-year-old, efficiently operated hospital for the care of the sick and injured, especially when these patients are served annually at a cost in round figures of one-half million dollars for all purposes. I urge you to vote for this amendment.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

(Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee has made a very eloquent appeal in support of his amendment and has quoted many facts and figures which I will not repeat.

The hospital in Savannah is an old institution established in 1907, 1 year prior to the year I first saw the light of day. It is a real institution in our part of the country. It has performed a wonderful service for many Federal employees who have been injured in line of duty for seamen and coastguardsmen from that southeastern area. It is in a coastal city. That is where one Public Health hospital should be. There are other areas of the country, of course, that require hospital facilities, but surely one of the greatest demands on these hospitals comes from our maritime activities.

I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee that the one at Memphis is well located. The interesting thing about this problem is that the Public Health people have testified that these hospitals are economically operated. They make no complaint whatsoever about the method of operation, and their caseload has been high. It is true they are taking veterans out of these hospitals. The

one at Savannah has had about 50 veterans in it. But suppose it does not run to capacity at all times, we must have available facilities. In the city of Savannah there is not a single hospital today available for the Government or the Public Health Service to contract with in order to treat Federal patients. The civilian demand upon the hospitals has been so great that patients are out in the halls of the hospitals today instead of in private rooms. Under the amendment we voted on a moment ago, a Hill-Burton hospital is scheduled for that city. It is not known whether they will get it now. I suppose we will find that out tomorrow when we take the final vote on this question.

I might point out, too, that this hospital at Savannah serves an area from Miami to Norfolk and from New Orleans to Norfolk. It is a very vital institution and deserves consideration by the Congress. If there were some mitigating circumstances that would justify its closing, that would be one thing, but in this case there are not any such circumstances.

It may be argued that these veterans coming out of the hospital will leave it below its maximum capacity.

That is true, but we never know when a disaster of some sort will occur and fill it to overcapacity. So, if it is used, 75 percent of its capacity, which I am sure it will be even with the veterans taken out, the hospital will serve a very useful need and purpose in that area. It was not the recommendation of the Public Health Service that this hospital or the one at Memphis be closed. This came as the result of committee action. The figure asked for by the Public Health Service would have prevented the closing of these two hospitals, the one in Memphis and the one in Savannah, because they felt they could justify their existence from a priority standpoint better than they could some hospital in some other section of the country. So we appeal to you from the standpoint of fairness that this large area of the State mentioned by my distinguished colleague should not be cleared of any Federal hospital to treat Federal patients. But certainly these 2, out of the total number we have in this country, something like 18, should be retained in the southeastern part of the United States. Historically Congress has tried to operate on that basis. It has been the purpose of Congress in dealing with these programs to give area coverage and not concentrate these services in any particular section. That is why they were established that way and that is why we should maintain them today and not clear this area completely of these facilities while other sections are adequately taken care of.

Mr. Chairman, I ask support of this amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I realize that some of the Members have these hospitals in their districts, and I think they should be given time to speak on this amendment, but I wonder if we could have an agreement on time. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on amendments to this para-

graph close in 10 minutes, the last 2½ minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. In Cleveland, Ohio, which is a seaport on Lake Erie, we have practically the same situation that obtains with reference to what was brought out by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]. In addition, in Cleveland, there has been a very large shortage of veteran hospital beds and this marine hospital in Cleveland has been affording 60 beds for the veterans. It seems very foolish to me to close a very modern, well equipped, up-to-date medical facility when people must obtain hospital care. There is not a sufficient number of beds available in the other voluntary public and private hospitals in that particular area. So it seems very unwise to me to close this hospital that is so fully equipped and modern when you are not saving money, because the Public Health Administration would have to make contracts with other hospitals in order to take care of that load, and the fact that there is not a sufficient number of beds available in that particular area would necessitate many of these people traveling far distances throughout the country which would add up to an unnecessary expenditure of funds, and certainly it would not be a saving.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take much of the time of the Committee. Others are to speak on this, and the time has already been fixed. I simply want to direct just a few statements to the hospitals in Memphis, Tenn., because I happen to be more familiar with that. I am sure all the others are equally meritorious.

I have been unable to find any justification from the Public Health Service or from any other source for closing down the last remaining Public Health Service hospital on the inland waters of the United States. I know also there is an extreme hospital-bed shortage in the city of Memphis, Tenn., despite the fact that today \$4 million of private money is being spent in that city to expand hospital facilities. If the chairman of the subcommittee could give me one justification for closing down this hospital in Memphis, Tenn., I would like to have it, either quoting somebody or giving his own opinion.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. May I say that the Eisenhower budget did not contain any justification for this cut. They recommended this full amount.



Mr. PRIEST. I understand the Public Health Service certainly does not recommend closing it down.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] made an important point for consideration a moment ago. This Congress itself has given the responsibility of taking care of certain categories of patients to the Public Health Service. If they cannot take care of them at Memphis, Savannah, Cleveland, and other points where those hospitals are now in operation, then they are going to have to enter into contracts to send them across the country somewhere else for their hospitalization, because Congress itself has said, "You are responsible for their hospital treatment."

Having served as chairman of the Public Health Subcommittee of my committee for a number of years and kept in close touch with this situation, frankly, the closing down of these Public Health Service hospitals to me simply does not square with good economy or sound judgment. I am willing to hear any reasonable explanation, but up to this point I have not been able to get any explanation which to me sounds reasonable.

[Mr. CROSSER addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, as far as the committee is concerned, it is not closing any hospitals. The application of funds to individual hospitals is left entirely to the United States Public Health Service. The four hospitals that have been mentioned today are hospitals that the Public Health Service thinks it may have to close if it does not get the full appropriation requested. As for the recommended appropriation, the amount provided in this bill is 60 percent more than the amount appropriated in 1948, and is in excess of the amount appropriated for any prior year, with the single exception of 1953. I call your attention to the hearings on page 907 dealing with the patient-load in the Public Health Service hospitals. You will see it was estimated that the number of veterans who have been in these hospitals will be reduced in 1954 by over 50 percent from the number in 1952. They were reimbursed by the Veterans' Administration for these patients. The Veterans' Administration is taking the veterans out of the Public Health Service hospitals and putting them in the Veterans' Administration hospitals. If current plans materialize, the patient-load at some hospitals will be reduced to the point where it will be uneconomical to continue their operation as Public Health Service hospitals. If these four hospitals should have to be closed, and I am not sure that all four of them will have to be closed, they are not going to be simply junked. You have just heard a big plea here this afternoon for the Hill-Burton hospital program, and for more hospitals throughout the United States. If these hospitals are closed as Government institutions, they will be transferred to State or local agencies, or

groups that can utilize them as general hospitals.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, during recent hearings on health, education, and welfare appropriations, the Public Health Service indicated it might be necessary to close the hospital at Fort Stanton, N. Mex. The reason assigned of course is an economy measure but I am unable to appreciate fully the logic behind the move curtailing activities at this particular hospital yet operating other hospitals in locations which are disadvantageous to rehabilitative work on tubercular patients.

This hospital was originally turned over to the Public Health Service half a century ago for tubercular patients, because it was so ideally adapted for that purpose. Everyone knows that New Mexico with its sunshine and excellent dry climate is a mecca for tuberculars. Nowhere in the country could the Government have found a better location with as good facilities and proper surroundings for that class of patients than in Fort Stanton.

Regardless of whether or not the cut made in the Public Health budget is restored or not, I am certain that upon due and careful consideration of the Public Health Service, they will conclude that this will not be 1 of the 4 hospitals which they feel must be closed. As a matter of fact we in the committee believe that with certain economies in the operation of the Public Health Service, none of these hospitals need to be closed. This is the only merchant seamen hospital in the entire southwest area, and the tubercular patients in this hospital are now living in fear that they will be transferred to some more humid climate in hospitals located around the Great Lakes, in the east coast, or in the west coast. To make sure that there will be ample funds for the Public Health Service to operate efficiently, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BUSBEY. The facts in the case are simply that the patient-load in these hospitals for 1954, according to the estimate of the Public Health Service, will be so low that it will not be economical nor efficient to operate them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be rereported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 19, line 16, strike out "\$32,500,000" and insert "\$34,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentle-

man from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 65, noes 77.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PRESTON and Mr. BUSBEY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 73, noes 100.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois.

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LONG: Page 21, line 19, strike out "\$1,650,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,700,000."

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, oral health problems have long been the stepchild of Congress in its efforts to assist in solving the overall health problems of our people. They should not be so. Although one does not ordinarily die of a dental disorder there is virtually no one in the entire population who is free for all of his lifetime from diseases of the oral cavity. As a matter of fact, dental caries is pandemic affecting 95 percent of all Americans no matter where they may live. Periodontal disorders, known to the laymen as pyorrhea, probably afflict about 80 percent of the adult population. More than one-half of all persons in the country over the age of 50 wear, or should wear, a full or partial denture to replace their missing teeth. An uncounted number of individuals of the population have some malformation of the jaws which affects their ability to masticate properly and which, in many instances is a sufficiently grotesque physical characteristic as to create a social and psychological problem. The most frequent congenital defect which is found in the human race is cleft lip and palate, known better to you as hare-lip. Even children are not immune to dental disease and scientific studies have established that 50 percent of the children in the 2-year age group will have 1 or more decayed teeth; that by age 6, the beginning school age, each child will have at least 3 cavities and by the not-too-advanced age of 16, most adolescents, male and female, will have at least 7 teeth which are decayed, missing, or filled with at least 14 tooth surfaces involved.

I cannot parade before you the lame, the halt, and the blind, as can those who advocate funds for the more dramatic killer and crippling diseases and the dentists do not begrudge 1 cent appropriated by the Congress for the relief of humanity from the affliction of such scourges. I can only point to statistical facts about the extent of the oral health problem and hope that perhaps the memory of that forgotten toothache, the recollection of all those whom you know



who wear dentures, taken together with the facts in the problem will impress upon you its universality and its seriousness.

Frankly, the dental profession of this country is becoming discouraged. For more than 100 years we have been developing our profession for the purpose of attempting to alleviate oral disorders. We have built more and more dental schools, we have trained ever-increasing numbers of dentists, but we find that we cannot keep up with the ever-accumulating backlog of dental defects which need our attention. We have spent years of our own time and vast amounts of our own money in attempting to seek means to combat the overwhelming incidence of dental disease. We have concentrated on educating the public to better mouth hygiene so that they would not have so much need for our services. Our State societies have established research foundations; our national society has established research fellowships in universities and within the very halls of government; our members have given freely of their time to study, in their spare hours, the causes and cures for dental disorders. We have done all we know how to do and as the years go by we will continue our efforts in the hope that we can do more. But outside of our own profession only a few have interested themselves in this great health problem.

For years we have supported the establishment of dental divisions in State and local health departments. For years we have supported the majority of the activities of the Dental Division of the United States Public Health Service. In 1947 we dentists were able to convince Congress of the necessity and importance of establishing a National Institute of Dental Research through which research efforts in the dental health field could be coordinated and new techniques, new methods of prevention, new cures be discovered and made known for the benefit of the public. An early result of your action in establishing that Institute was the successful coordination of years of independent research into the reaction of fluorine upon the tooth structure. Consequently, we know today that it is possible to reduce the incidence of dental caries by as much as 60 percent in the coming generation by fluoridating our community water supplies and by as much as 40 percent in areas where that method is impractical, by applying fluorine topically to the teeth of children. The Congress generously provided funds for the demonstration of that significant research result and future generations will benefit from it.

But the development of the fluorine technique is not the "be all and end all" of dental research. Innumerable problems in the periodontal diseases, in malocclusion, in the cause of caries, in the improvement of prosthetic appliances, in the use of antibiotics, and in many other dental fields await evaluation and study. The day when their solution will come about can be speeded by adequate appropriations for the activities of the Na-

tional Institute of Dental Research and the Dental Division of the Public Health Service.

The appropriations for the dental activities of the Public Health Service will not be confined in effect to the operations of that agency alone. They will directly affect the economy of the entire country, and will, in future years, affect the amount of money which it will be necessary for the Congress to appropriate for Federal treatment programs. Consider, if you will, these facts:

Today the Federal Government is spending close to \$90 million a year for dental-treatment programs. Fifty million is being spent for the maintenance of such programs in the Armed Forces; more than 30 million is being expended for dental care for veterans; and the balance is spent by the Public Health Service, out of appropriations other than the one of which we speak, for treatment programs for merchant seamen, for Indians, for the United States Coast Guard, for the inmates of Federal prisons and other institutions. In addition to these sums, the public at large is spending nearly a billion dollars a year for dental treatment. Based upon a population of 150 million—and the population is now larger—that amounts to \$6.66 per capita per year for dental maintenance. However, in research to reduce the problem which results in these great costs, the Federal Government for each of the past 5 years has spent on an average of only 1.1 cents per capita.

These costs can be reduced in future years by an intelligent program of research adequately financed today.

It is difficult to understand why only dental activities must bear the effect of the congressional scalpel since the committee was able to find additional millions to appropriate, over and above the revised presidential request for the cancer, mental health, heart, arthritis, and neurology institutes. Only microbiology shared with dental health in a cut from the revised request.

It is not my intention to say that the appropriations for these important activities should be reduced. I recognize their importance and applaud the Congress for its vision in providing adequate funds for them. But I do feel that there is an unjustifiable lack of proportion between the amounts annually appropriated for these more dramatic illnesses and the amount appropriated for research into the pandemic diseases of the oral cavity which also impair the efficiency, health, and comfort of human beings.

Contrast some of the differences in the scope of programs for these purposes. The proposed appropriation for dental health will permit the continuation only of the existing 36 dental research projects now supported by these funds. No additional projects can be commenced until those now under study are completed. But as against 36 dental research projects there are 111 existing projects in arthritis and metabolic diseases, 207 projects in microbiology, 140 projects in neurology and blindness, 114 projects in mental health activities, and

430 projects in cancer. Contrast the 14 dental research fellowships now in existence and to be continued without increase with the 178 fellowships for cancer, the 74 fellowships for mental health activities, the 130 fellowships for heart research, the 38 fellowships for arthritis, the 45 fellowships for microbiology, and the 36 fellowships for neurology, and determine for yourself if an adequate effort is being supported with respect to oral diseases.

I recommend that the House increase the total budget for dental health activities to the \$2,700,000 originally requested. This will amount to an expenditure of 1.8 cents for each member of the population, less than the present cost of a postcard. This would permit an increase in the number of research fellowships and research dental projects; it would permit the continuation at the present level of the regional activities of the dental division of the Public Health Service which provide technical assistance to the dental health divisions in each of your States. It would permit the undertaking of studies to determine the extent of malocclusion and cleft palate and the making of grants to universities for the construction of necessary research facilities.

I ask your support of the amendment.

(Mr. LONG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. Chairman, this illustrates the point I have often made back in the District, in talking to nonpolitical organizations, such as the Kiwanis, the Lions, and the church organizations: That the House of Representatives is the greatest cross section of American life in the whole United States. Every group is represented, whether it is labor, industry, agriculture, mining, cattle raising, the medical, dental, or any other profession you may name. I can appreciate the concern of my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], but let me point out 1 or 2 things. This is the same amount that was appropriated last year, \$1,650,000.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. May I make just the observation that there has never been a sufficient amount appropriated to carry on decent dental research in the United States of America.

Mr. BUSBEY. I appreciate the gentleman's interest for his profession. However, I thought that, if the committee was going to be criticized, it would be criticized for providing too much in this bill, inasmuch as we recommended no reduction below last year. This amendment would increase the appropriation from \$1,650,000 to \$2,700,000, which was the original estimate in the Truman budget. But do not forget that, in the Truman budget, there was \$500,000 for



construction, which the Department did not even request.

Further, the personnel of this institute are spending too much of their time running around the country trying to sell communities on the fluoridation of water. The institute has 102 technical dental employees, with 52 automobiles, traveling all over the Nation.

I think the committee has been exceedingly generous, and I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Long].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUDGE: Page 32, line 18, after the parenthesis strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and including in said definition employees engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on a mutual, nonprofit basis and at least 95 percent of the water stored or supplied thereby is used for farming purposes."

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, so far as I know there is no opposition to this amendment. The bill has for some time carried the language which is the proviso on page 32. There was some misunderstanding as to how that applies with regard to ditch riders who are employed by the farmers in the operation of mutually-owned and operated canals and irrigation systems. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ], who is familiar with it, and a member of the committee. If there are any questions I should be happy to attempt to answer them.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Will this help put water on the land?

Mr. BUDGE. Well, I do not know that it will do that but it brings the ditch rider, who is in a basic agricultural occupation, within the same category as all agricultural employees as far as the National Labor Relations Act is concerned.

Mr. JENSEN. They are not agricultural workers.

Mr. BUDGE. Oh, I think they are. The only thing that they do is to assist in getting water on the land. Each irrigation district employs maybe 3 or 4 men who go up and down the ditches and keep the water in them and to raise the headgates.

Mr. JENSEN. Has the Department of Agriculture ever designated this group of employees as agricultural workers?

Mr. BUDGE. I believe that they have always been understood to be agricultural workers because they do nothing except act in furtherance of agricultural pursuits.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am in full agreement with the gentleman's amendment. I think it is a very necessary amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to say that I am in full accord with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho and I would like to have him know that the farmer from Chicago concurs in his amendment.

Mr. BUDGE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I am happy to rise and speak on behalf of the medical research activities at the National Institutes of Health.

In reading some of the testimony of the Director of that research program, I found a statement dealing with hardening of the arteries. As all of you know, this disease—which strikes down so many men in their prime of life, including an unfortunately large number of Members of this House—is one for which there is no known cause or cure. Dr. Sebrell quoted from a summary article on this disease, placed in the Journal of the American Medical Association by an important member of our great pharmaceutical industry. The article reports in part on the work of Drs. Anfinson, Boyle, and Brown, all of the National Heart Institute, one of the National Institutes of Health. Few among us would be interested in the technical scientific description of their research. But all of us can interpret this kind of direct quote:

The work—

Of these scientists—

is a tour de force of the canniest reasoning and most arduous analytic techniques to appear in decades.

As I understand it, there are over 300 such research projects going on out there in the Public Health Service laboratories in Bethesda, Md. Many of them will pay off; some of them will not. There is no way to tell which will bring an important finding and which will lead you up a blind alley. We can only give brilliant and dedicated men both good facilities and an intellectually stimulating climate—and wait, knowing that in the future as in the past, medical research will pay rich dividends.

I would like to quote from Dr. Howard Rusk, Chairman of the Health Resources Advisory Board under both President Truman and President Eisenhower, and an eminent authority on rehabilitation. He wrote in the New York Times describing how medical research saves dollars as well as human lives:

In the period between 1937 and 1950, the death rate in the United States declined 15 percent, largely because of the sulfa drugs and antibiotics. This decline represents a saving of 1,753,347 lives, for if the 1937 death rate of 11.3 had prevailed through 1950; this many more people would have died.

This decline has resulted in the addition of an estimated \$2,500,000,000 in earn-

ing to the national income. As a result of this additional income, the Federal Government has gained an additional \$165 million in Federal income taxes each year, plus the revenues gained through other types of taxes.

Dr. Rusk will vouch for his statistics. But evidently, medical research yielding better health does have a major effect on the national economy. The same writer then goes on to comment on the matter now under consideration before this House:

The new administration is now engaged in a restudy of the budget for the next fiscal year, with the announced objective of making substantial cuts wherever possible. Few people will disagree with this highly desirable objective. Such cuts, however, should be selected and not aimed at programs such as medical research, which pay dividends in both lives and dollars.

The Congress of the United States has made substantial contributions to the development of medical research through its appropriations to the National Institutes of Health over the years, but particularly since World War II. During the 5-year period from 1947 to 1952, the research grant, fellowship, training, and other grant activities were increased to \$34.5 millions, and the direct laboratory and field research programs were increased to \$13 millions.

Any period of rapid expansion, whether industrial or governmental, creates extreme administrative problems. Caution needs to be exercised to see that administrative costs do not rise disproportionately, along with a sacrifice in quality of research.

Management experts tell us that growing organizations need to pay constant attention to the economy of their administrative structure, a premise with which I agree. Knowing that the National Institutes of Health has expanded rapidly, I have made inquiry into its administrative and indirect costs. I found to my pleasure that the program has maintained a high degree of productivity, with a steady decrease in the relative amounts of funds needed for administration.

On its direct operations, administrative costs have been reduced from 8.5 percent in 1950 to only 6.3 in the revised 1954 budget estimate.

These figures convinced me that the National Institutes of Health is running an efficient operation, comparing favorably with the best of private industries and universities engaged in research. I think that every Member of this House should be satisfied that here is a program in which the taxpayer gets value received for his dollar expenditure.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropria-



tions for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings in connection with this bill be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

(Mr. GARMATZ (at the request of Mr. FOGARTY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, in considering the Appropriations Committee's recommendations for the National Institutes of Health, the Congress knows that more than two-thirds of its funds are invested in the Nation's medical schools, universities, and research institutions in the form of grants for research and related activities. These grants constitute participation and support in areas for which adequate non-Federal funds are not available—specific research projects, increased medical and scientific manpower, improved research facilities.

It is support that means the difference between whether a very large portion of the good medical research of the country will be done or not. It is a complementary support which makes possible many, if not the majority, of the medical research advances against our greatest killers, the chronic diseases that we read of in the press. Without these funds, the work would not be done. It means, in short, the difference between progress and stagnation in research against our Nation's leading causes of death and disability.

In administering the grants program, the National Institutes of Health has developed a system which brings the best brains in medical and other sciences to bear on matters of policy and the selection on projects to be supported—and it does this without restricting scientific freedom. Twenty-five percent of all research in the Nation's medical schools last year received grant assistance from the Public Health Service. The schools and the scientists have many times attested that the grants are administered not merely in a satisfactory, but in a highly praiseworthy manner.

The Congress is always interested in the costs of administering such a program. We have heard on the floor of this House many times in the last few days debate on overhead and administration items. The cost of administering the grants program at the National Institutes of Health in 1952 was only 3.15 percent.

It is illuminating to compare these figures with those for non-Federal organizations of similar purpose—the support of research. The Ford Foundation, for example, spent 9.2 percent of its money for administration in 1952; the Commonwealth Fund, 15.5 percent; the Field Foundation, 6.8 percent; and the Rockefeller foundation, 10.3. These figures are not extremes, but represent reasonable costs of operating grant-support programs through private sources.

Low as the National Institutes of Health's figure for grant administration is, it could be still lower if we directed them to sacrifice the soundness, the truly national character of their program by restricting their scientific reviewing groups, advisory council members, and other consultants to a small eastern area. The cost of administering this program could be further reduced by leaving its direction and control in the hands of a few Federal employees, transfixed behind desks in Washington, a truly bureaucratic program.

That, ladies and gentlemen, would be a grave error. The strength of this research program and the validity of this method of research support lie in the fact that an amount of money designated by Congress is allocated solely on the basis of the merit of the projects. Determination is made entirely on the basis of advice and recommendations of prominent scientists, aided by competent and interested laymen on the advisory councils, all drawn from every part of our country.

This program, which stands as a landmark in the use of Federal grants for the ultimate good of the American people, is vital to all of us. I know that this House will not take any action to place it in jeopardy.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 10 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H. R. 5246.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONVEY CERTAIN SCHOOL PROPERTIES TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS OR PUBLIC AGENCIES

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1242) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies, with

a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after "tribe" insert ": *Provided further*, That no more than twenty acres of land shall be transferred under the terms of this act in connection with any single school property conveyed to State or local governmental agencies or to local school authorities."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Montana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ALLOTMENT OF LANDS OF THE CROW TRIBE

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1244) to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds and for other purposes," with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Line 6, after "sold" insert ", or patents in fee may be issued therefor."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MAY 22, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,  
*House of Representatives.*

SIR: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, I have received a subpoena duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before the Grand Jury of said court in reference to an investigation of possible violation of 18 U. S. C. 1001, and to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

The rules and practice of the House of Representatives indicates that the Clerk may not, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpoena duces tecum produce such papers without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of certain of the documents and papers requested without such consent.

The subpoena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very truly yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,  
*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*



The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES IN RE INVESTIGATION OF POSSIBLE VIOLATION OF 18TH UNITED STATES CODE, PAGE 1001—GRAND JURY ORIGINAL

The President of the United States to Hon. Lyle Snader, Clerk of the House of Representatives, room P42, United States Capitol Building:

(And bring with you: All clerk-hire forms and other papers relating to employees of Congressman ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT and their employment, including payroll records during the period of Mr. BRAMBLETT's service as a Member of the House of Representatives.)

(Please report to Assistant United States Attorney William Hitz or Assistant United States Attorney William Becker, room 3400G, New Courthouse Building.)

You are hereby commanded to attend before the grand jury of said court on Thursday, the 28th day of May 1953, at 9:15 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the Court without leave of the Court or District Attorney.

Witness: The Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 21st day of May 1953.

HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.

By MARGARET L. BOSWELL, Deputy Clerk.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 245) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in re investigation of possible violation of 18th United States Code, page 1001, a subpoena duces tecum was issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and addressed to Lyle Snader, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear before the grand jury of said court on Thursday, the 28th day of May 1953, at 9:15 a'clock antemeridian to testify and to bring with him certain forms, papers, and records in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession, of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

*Resolved*, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

*Resolved*, That Lyle O. Snader, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the grand jury of the court named in the subpoena duces tecum before-mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers, documents, or records on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

*Resolved*, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers, documents, and records called for in the subpoena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceedings and then always at any place under the orders

and control of this House and take copies of any papers, documents, or records and the Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such papers, documents, or records in possession or control of said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, so as, however, the possession of said papers, documents, and records by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further.

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena duces tecum aforementioned.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### IN RE: INVESTIGATION OF POSSIBLE VIOLATION OF 18TH UNITED STATES CODE, PAGE 1001

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays on the desk a communication which the Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,  
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1953.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,  
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the United States District Court for the District of Columbia I have received a subpoena duces tecum, directed to me as Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to appear before the Grand Jury of said court as a witness in re investigation of possible violation of 18 U. S. C. 1001 and to bring with me certain records therein described.

The rules and practice of the House of Representatives indicate that the Sergeant at Arms may not either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpoena duces tecum produce such records without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of the records without such consent.

The subpoena in question is herewith attached and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very truly yours,  
WILLIAM F. RUSSELL,  
Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES—IN RE INVESTIGATION OF POSSIBLE VIOLATION OF 18TH UNITED STATES CODE, PAGE 1001—GRAND JURY ORIGINAL

The President of the United States to Hon. William E. Russell, Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol Building:

(And bring with you: All records of Government checks cashed by your office for Congressman ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT or any of his employees during the period of Mr. BRAMBLETT's service as a Member of the House of Representatives.)

(Please report to Assistant United States Attorney William Hitz or Assistant United States Attorney William Becker, room 3400G, New Courthouse Building.)

You are hereby commanded to attend before the grand jury of said court on Thursday, the 28th day of May 1953, at 9:15 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness: The Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 21st day of May 1953.

HARRY M. HULL, Clerk,  
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,  
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 246) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in re investigation of possible violation of 18th United States Code, page 1001, a subpoena duces tecum was issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and addressed to William E. Russell, Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear before the grand jury of said court on Thursday, the 28th day of May 1953 at 9:15 o'clock antemeridian to testify and to bring with him certain records in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

*Resolved*, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

*Resolved*, That William F. Russell, Sergeant at Arms of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the grand jury of the court named in the subpoena duces tecum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Sergeant at Arms of the House; be it further

*Resolved*, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpoena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers and the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents and papers in possession or control of said Sergeant at Arms that the court has found to be material and relevant, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Sergeant at Arms shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Sergeant at Arms; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena duces tecum aforementioned.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REDUCE SOCIAL SECURITY AGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. ARENDS]. Under previous order of the











# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued May 27, 1953

For actions of May 26, 1953

83rd-1st, No. 96

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

## CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	1,29	Flammable fabrics.....	3	Rubber.....	18
Budgeting.....	12	Flood control.....	1	St. Lawrence seaway.....	22
Buildings.....	17	Foreign aid.....	27	School-lunch program.....	6
Commodity exchanges.....	14	Interest rates.....	11	Student-exchange pro-	
CCC pea sales.....	2	Lands, grazing.....	9	gram.....	26
Corn.....	10	Leave.....	5,8	Trade, foreign.....	25
Economic problems.....	19	Personnel.....	5,8,16,24	Transportation.....	4
Education.....	1,15	Prices, support.....	10	Watershed projects.....	20
Electrification.....	23	Reclamation.....	13	Wheat.....	10,27
Expenditures.....	28	Reorganization.....	7,21		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed measure for single appropriation bill and bill to amend Leave Act. Sen. Mansfield criticized stockmen's grazing bill. Senate made USDA reorganization plan its unfinished business. Sens. Young and Mundt defended price supports and favored increases in corn and wheat carryovers. House passed Labor-HEW appropriation bill. House debated Army civil appropriation bill. House committee ordered reported bill to repeal Thomas leave rider. Rep. Shelley criticized CCC's sale of peas. Rep. Hope favored USDA reorganization plan. Rep. Hope presented watershed program.

## HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed, 395-2, with amendments H. R. 5246, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1954. Adopted, 237-156, the amendment to increase by 6 million the funds for payments to school districts in Federally impacted areas (this amendment had previously been agreed to in Committee of the Whole). (pp. 5769-71.)  
Began debate on H. R. 5376, the Army civil functions appropriation bill (pp. 5772-804). This bill contains flood-control items for the Corps of Engineers. See end of this Digest for excerpts from the committee report.
2. CCC PEA SALES. Rep. Shelley criticized CCC for its "sale of 80,000 tons of dried winter peas to a select group of buyers at a price well below the sale price then current," inserted his letter to the Secretary asking for details of this transaction; and criticized the lack of a reply as yet. Reps. Hope and Cooley discussed the subject with Rep. Shelley and implied that the Agriculture Committee would look into it. (pp. 5805-9.)
3. FLAMMABLE FABRICS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 5069, prohibiting interstate commerce in highly flammable apparel and fabrics (pp. 5805, 5813).
4. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 3203, restricting the ICC from exercising control over the duration of leases, contracts, and other agreements for motor-vehicle use by common carriers (p. D472).



5. PERSONNEL. The Judiciary Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 4126, to continue war-risk and detention benefits for Federal employees until July 1, 1954 (p. D472).

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 4506, to repeal the Thomas leave rider. The Daily Digest states: "As amended, the bill repeals the Thomas leave rider beginning January of next year (1954) and extends the time for taking leave earned in the calendar year 1952 until January 2, 1954. It also amends the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 by changing the 60 days of leave which employees may accumulate to 26 days, and changing the 90 days which employees outside the United States (except Foreign Service employees) may accumulate to 60 days. The bill changes the leave year so that it ends with the last full pay period. This will give employees an opportunity to use leave over the Christmas holidays without losing it in cases where they have accumulated excess leave. Leave already accumulated is preserved under the terms of the amended bill." (p. D473.)

6. SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM. Received resolutions from the Mass. Legislature opposing reduction in school-lunch funds (p. 5814).

#### SENATE

7. REORGANIZATION. S. Res. 100, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, relating to this Department, was made the unfinished business (p. 5767).
8. PERSONNEL. Passed with amendments H. R. 4654, to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 (see Digest 95 for provisions). Agreed to a Williams amendment to bar payments for terminal leave in excess of 60 days and to require refund of terminal-leave payments in certain cases of reemployment. (pp. 5733-7.)
9. GRAZING LANDS. Sen. Mansfield criticized H. R. 4023 and S. 1491, the so-called stockmen's grazing bills, and inserted communications he has received against the bills (pp. 5718-28).
10. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sens. Young and Mundt defended the price-support program and recommended increases in corn and wheat carryovers (pp. 5757-60).  
Received from the Hawaii Legislature a resolution favoring price supports for rice and taro grown in Hawaii (pp. 5714-5).
11. INTEREST RATES. Sen. Bush defended the recent increases in interest rates on Government securities (pp. 5728-33).
12. BUDGETING. Agreed, as reported, to S. Con. Res. 8, providing for a consolidated appropriation bill (pp. 5737-8, 5743-54, 5760-7). The measure also requires appropriation bills to set forth limitations on obligations during the budget year, and requires revenue estimates to be submitted in connection with appropriation bills.
13. RECLAMATION. Received a Calif. Legislature resolution urging renegotiation of irrigation contracts in the Central Valley project (p. 5714).

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

14. COMMODITY EXCHANGES. S. 1990, by Sen. Young, to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 5715). Remarks of author (p. 5716).
15. EDUCATION. H. R. 5397, by Rep. Howell, to provide for a National War Memorial Arts Commission; to Education and Labor Committee (p. 5814).



# House of Representatives

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Burton Coffman, minister, Church of Christ, Washington D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Thou art He before whom the generations of men rise and fade away. From everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God. From Thee comes every good and perfect gift. To Thee, we lift our hearts in thanksgiving. Of Thee, we pray forgiveness of our sins.

O God, bless the President of the United States, the Members of Congress, and the judiciary. Bless these servants of the people that they may have wisdom to know what is right, courage to do what is right, and sufficient support of their constituents to sustain them in what is right. Endow these Thy servants with grace and knowledge to the end that the wounds of our bleeding world may be healed and peace on earth prevail. May Thy name be glorified and Thy kingdom be increased throughout all nations. God bless the United States of America and this House of Representatives. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING

(Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the nationwide hue and cry about the administration's proposed reduction in the budget of the Air Force is "much ado about nothing." Here are the facts:

First. As of June 30 this year there will be an unexpended balance in our military procurement funds—appropriated last year but not spent as yet—of \$45.6 billion, of which \$26.8 billion represent outstanding orders for aircraft not yet constructed or delivered. That means 60 percent of the unexpended military appropriations of last year is for aircraft.

Second. More than 40 percent of all military appropriations for next year will be for aircraft, even with the reduced aircraft budget.

Third. The proposed reduction in the budget for the Air Force does not mean a reduction in our airpower. More than one-half of the Navy budget is for naval airpower. In fact, about 60 percent of the entire Eisenhower budget for national defense next year will be for airpower and air defense.

In the field of military planning, at least, President Eisenhower is at home and is a topnotch authority.

## H. R. 5246, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

(Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that before this appropriation bill is enacted into law a provision will be inserted granting some authority to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to transfer funds, especially those funds provided for the Secretary's office. The Appropriations Committee of the other body should call upon the Secretary and General Counsel of the Department to present their views in this matter. Should the other body so amend this measure, it ought to be accepted by the House.

It is evident that in the past the Congress has indicated mistrust of the Federal Security Agency. That agency did spend money and did engage in propaganda activities not authorized by law. The situation is now changed and in the interests of sound administration it is necessary that certain reorganization take place. To do this the Secretary must have the authority to transfer funds. I might call attention to the fact that the budget for the Department was made up before Reorganization Plan No. 1 became effective.

If the Congress wants sound economical administration of our laws, we must give honest and dependable heads of departments the authority to make the best possible use of the funds appropriated.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

## DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Fogarty amendment on page 15, line 1.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, line 1, strike out "\$60,500,000" and insert "\$66,500,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALLECK) there were—ayes 25, noes 31.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 236, noes 156, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—236

Abernethy	Chenoweth	Friedel
Addonizio	Chudoff	Fulton
Albert	Colmer	Garmatz
Andrews	Condon	Gary
Aspinall	Cooley	Gathings
Ayres	Cooper	George
Bailey	Corbett	Golden
Baker	Crosser	Gordon
Barden	Cunningham	Granahan
Barrett	Davis, Ga.	Green
Battle	Davis, Tenn.	Gregory
Belcher	Dawson, Ill.	Hagen, Calif.
Bennett, Fla.	Dawson, Utah	Hagen, Minn.
Berry	Deane	Hale
Bishop	Dempsey	Hardy
Blatnik	Dollinger	Harris
Boland	Donohue	Harrison, Wyo.
Bolling	Donovan	Hart
Bonner	Dorn, N. Y.	Hays, Ark.
Bramblett	Dorn, S. C.	Hays, Ohio
Brown, Ga.	Doyle	Hébert
Brown, Ohio	Durham	Heller
Broyhill	Eberhart	Herlong
Buchanan	Edmondson	Heselton
Burdick	Engle	Hill
Byrd	Evins	Hollfield
Byrne, Pa.	Fallon	Holmes
Camp	Feighan	Holtzman
Campbell	Fernandez	Hope
Canfield	Fine	Horan
Cannon	Fino	Howell
Carlyle	Fogarty	Hyde
Carnahan	Forand	Ikard
Celler	Fountain	Jarman
Chatham	Frazier	Javits
Chelf	Frelinghuysen	Johnson



Jonas, Ill.  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Judd  
Karsten, Mo.  
Kearns  
Kee  
Kelley, Pa.  
Kelly, N. Y.  
Keogh  
Kilday  
King, Calif.  
Klrwan  
Klein  
Kluczynski  
Knox  
Landrum  
Lane  
Lanham  
Lantaff  
Lesinski  
Long  
Lovre  
Lucas  
Lyle  
McCarthy  
McConnell  
McCormack  
McIntire  
McMillan  
Machrowicz  
Mack, Ill.  
Mack, Wash.  
Madden  
Magnuson  
Mahon  
Mailliard  
Marshall  
Matthews  
Morrow  
Metcalf  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Kans.

Mills  
Morgan  
Moss  
Moulder  
Multer  
Murray  
Nelson  
Norrell  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, Mich.  
O'Brien, N. Y.  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Konski  
O'Neill  
Patten  
Pelly  
Perkins  
Pfost  
Philbin  
Pillcher  
Poage  
Polk  
Preston  
Price  
Priest  
Rabaut  
Radwan  
Rayburn  
Reams  
Rees, Kans.  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Richards  
Riley  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Robeson, Va.  
Robison, Ky.  
Rodno  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rooney  
Sadlak  
Schenck

Scott  
Seely-Brown  
Selden  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Shuford  
Sieminski  
Sikes  
Small  
Smith, Kans.  
Smith, Miss.  
Spence  
Staggers  
Steed  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Teague  
Thomas  
Thompson, Tex.  
Thornberry  
Tollefson  
Trimble  
Vinson  
Vorys  
Walter  
Watts  
Westland  
Wheeler  
Whitten  
Wickersham  
Widnall  
Wier  
Williams, Miss.  
Willis  
Wilson, Calif.  
Wilson, Tex.  
Withrow  
Wolcott  
Wolverton  
Yates  
Yorty  
Zablocki

## NAYS—156

Abblitt  
Adair  
Alexander  
Allen, Calif.  
Allen, Ill.  
Andersen,  
H. Carl  
Andresen,  
August H.  
Arends  
Auchincloss  
Bates  
Beamer  
Bender  
Bennett, Mich.  
Bentley  
Bentsen  
Betts  
Boggs  
Bolton,  
Frances P.  
Bolton,  
Oliver P.  
Bonin  
Bosch  
Bow  
Brownson  
Budge  
Burleson  
Busbey  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Carrigg  
Cederberg  
Chlperfield  
Church  
Clardy  
Clevenger  
Cole, Mo.  
Cole, N. Y.  
Coon  
Cotton  
Cretella  
Crumpacker  
Curtis, Mass.  
Curtis, Mo.  
Curtis, Nebr.  
Dague  
Davis, Wis.  
Derounlan  
Devereux  
D'Ewart  
Dles  
Dondero  
Dowdy

Ellsworth  
Fenton  
Fisher  
Ford  
Gavin  
Gentry  
Goodwin  
Graham  
Gross  
Gubser  
Gwinn  
Halleck  
Hand  
Harden  
Harrison, Nebr.  
Harrison, Va.  
Harvey  
Hess  
Hiestand  
Hillelson  
Hinshaw  
Hoffman, Ill.  
Hoffman, Mich.  
Holt  
Hosmer  
Hruska  
Hunter  
Jackson  
James  
Jenkins  
Jensen  
Jonas, N. C.  
Jones, N. C.  
Kean  
Keating  
Kersten, Wis.  
Kilburn  
King, Pa.  
Krueger  
Laird  
Latham  
LeCompte  
McCulloch  
McDonough  
McGregor  
McVey  
Martin, Iowa  
Mason  
Meador  
Merrill  
Miller, Md.  
Miller, Nebr.  
Miller, N. Y.  
Morano

Mumma  
Neal  
Nicholson  
Norblad  
Oakman  
O'Hara, Minn.  
Osmers  
Ostertag  
Passman  
Patterson  
Phillips  
Poff  
Prouty  
Ray  
Reece, Tenn.  
Reed, Ill.  
Reed, N. Y.  
Regan  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Riehlman  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Mass.  
St. George  
Saylor  
Scherer  
Scrivner  
Seudder  
Shafer  
Sheehan  
Short  
Simpson, Ill.  
Simpson, Pa.  
Smith, Va.  
Smith, Wis.  
Stauffer  
Taber  
Talle  
Thompson,  
Mich.  
Tuck  
Van Pelt  
Van Zandt  
Velde  
Vursell  
Wainwright  
Wampler  
Warburton  
Weichel  
Wharton  
Wigglesworth  
Williams, N. Y.  
Young  
Younger

## NOT VOTING—38

Angell  
Becker  
Boykin  
Bray

Brooks, La.  
Brooks, Tex.  
Buckley  
Bush

Case  
Coudert  
Delaney  
Dingell

Dodd  
Dolliver  
Elliott  
Forrester  
Gamble  
Grant  
Haley  
Hillings  
Hoeven

Kearney  
Mollohan  
Morrison  
Patman  
Pillion  
Poulson  
Powell  
Rains  
Roosevelt

Secrest  
Springer  
Stringfellow  
Taylor  
Thompson, La.  
Utt  
Wilson, Ind.  
Winstead

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Kearney with Mr. Morrison.  
Mr. Bush with Mr. Forrester.  
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Grant.  
Mr. Gamble with Mr. Rains.  
Mr. Pillion with Mr. Elliott.  
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Delaney.  
Mr. Springer with Mr. Roosevelt.  
Mr. Stringfellow with Mr. Buckley.  
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Powell.  
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Patman.  
Mr. Case with Mr. Haley.  
Mr. Bray with Mr. Brooks of Louisiana.  
Mr. Becker with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.  
Mr. Angell with Mr. Winstead.  
Mr. Hillings with Mr. Secrest.  
Mr. Hoeven with Mr. Dodd.  
Mr. Utt with Mr. Mollohan.

Mr. VURSELL and Mr. MUMMA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BATTLE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 18, line 24, strike out "\$50 million" and insert in lieu thereof "\$75 million."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 197, nays 203, not voting 30, as follows:

## [Roll No. 45]

## YEAS—197

Abernethy  
Adair  
Addonizio  
Albert  
Alexander  
Andrews  
Aspinall  
Auchincloss  
Bailey  
Baker  
Barden  
Barrett

Battle  
Bennett, Mich.  
Blatnik  
Boggs  
Boland  
Bolling  
Boykin  
Brooks, Tex.  
Brown, Ga.  
Buchanan  
Burdick  
Byrd

Byrne, Pa.  
Camp  
Canfield  
Cannon  
Carlyle  
Carnahan  
Celler  
Chatham  
Chelf  
Chenoweth  
Chudoff  
Colmer

Condon  
Cooley  
Cooper  
Corbett  
Cresser  
Davis, Ga.  
Davis, Tenn.  
Dawson, Ill.  
Deane  
Dempsey  
Dingell  
Dollinger  
Donohue  
Dorn, N. Y.  
Dorn, S. C.  
Doyle  
Durham  
Eberharter  
Edmondson  
Engle  
Evins  
Fallon  
Feighan  
Fernandez  
Fine  
Fino  
Fogarty  
Forand  
Fountain  
Frazier  
Friedel  
Fulton  
Garmatz  
Gary  
Gathings  
Gordon  
Granahan  
Green  
Gregory  
Hagen, Calif.  
Hagen, Minn.  
Hale  
Harris  
Harrison, Wyo.  
Hart  
Hays, Ark.  
Hays, Ohio  
Hébert  
Heller  
Herlong  
Heseltun  
Hill  
Holifield  
Holtzman

Howell  
Javits  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Judd  
Karsten, Mo.  
Kee  
Kelley, Pa.  
Kelly, N. Y.  
Keogh  
Kersten, Wls.  
Kilday  
King, Calif.  
Kirwan  
Klein  
Kluczynski  
Landrum  
Lane  
Lanham  
Lesinski  
Long  
Lyle  
McCarthy  
McCormack  
McMillan  
Machrowicz  
Mack, Ill.  
Madden  
Magnuson  
Marshall  
Matthews  
Morrow  
Metcalf  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Kans.  
Mills  
Mollohan  
Morgan  
Moss  
Moulder  
Multer  
Murray  
Norrell  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, Mich.  
O'Brien, N. Y.  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Hara, Minn.  
O'Konski  
O'Neill  
Osmers  
Patten  
Perkins  
Pfost

Philbin  
Pillcher  
Poff  
Polk  
Powell  
Preston  
Price  
Priest  
Prouty  
Rabaut  
Rayburn  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Richards  
Riley  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Robeson, Va.  
Robison, Ky.  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rooney  
Roosevelt  
Scott  
Selden  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Sieminski  
Sikes  
Smith, Miss.  
Spence  
Staggers  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Teague  
Thompson, Tex.  
Thornberry  
Trimble  
Vinson  
Walter  
Wampler  
Watts  
Wheeler  
Wickersham  
Widnall  
Wier  
Williams, Miss.  
Willis  
Withrow  
Wolverton  
Yates  
Yorty  
Zablocki

## NAYS—203

Abblitt  
Allen, Calif.  
Allen, Ill.  
Andersen,  
H. Carl  
Andresen,  
August H.  
Arends  
Ayres  
Bates  
Beamer  
Belcher  
Bender  
Bennett, Fla.  
Bentley  
Bentsen  
Berry  
Betts  
Bishop  
Bolton,  
Frances P.  
Bolton,  
Oliver P.  
Bonin  
Bonner  
Bosch  
Bow  
Bramblett  
Bray  
Brown, Ohio  
Brownson  
Broghill  
Budge  
Burleson  
Busbey  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Campbell  
Carrigg  
Cederberg  
Chlperfield  
Church  
Clardy  
Clevenger  
Cole, Mo.  
Cole, N. Y.  
Coon  
Cotton  
Cretella  
Crumpacker

Cunningham  
Curtis, Mass.  
Curtis, Mo.  
Curtis, Nebr.  
Dague  
Davis, Wis.  
Dawson, Utah  
Derounlan  
Devereux  
D'Ewart  
Dles  
Dondero  
Donovan  
Dowdy  
Ellsworth  
Fenton  
Fisher  
Ford  
Frelinghuysen  
Gavin  
Gentry  
George  
Golden  
Goodwin  
Graham  
Gross  
Gubser  
Gwinn  
Halleck  
Hand  
Harden  
Hardy  
Harrison, Nebr.  
Harrison, Va.  
Harvey  
Hess  
Hiestand  
Hillelson  
Hinshaw  
Hoffman, Ill.  
Hoffman, Mich.  
Holmes  
Holt  
Hope  
Horan  
Hosmer  
Hruska  
Hunter  
Hyde

Ikard  
Jackson  
James  
Jarman  
Jenkins  
Jensen  
Johnson  
Jonas, Ill.  
Jonas, N. C.  
Jones, N. C.  
Kean  
Kearns  
Keating  
Kilburn  
King, Pa.  
Knox  
Krueger  
Laird  
Lantaff  
Latham  
LeCompte  
Lovre  
Lucas  
McConnell  
McCulloch  
McDonough  
McGregor  
McIntire  
McVey  
Mack, Wash.  
Mahon  
Mailliard  
Martin, Iowa  
Mason  
Meador  
Merrill  
Miller, Md.  
Miller, Nebr.  
Miller, N. Y.  
Morano  
Mumma  
Neal  
Nelson  
Nicholson  
Norblad  
Oakman  
Ostertag  
Passman  
Patterson



Pelly  
Phillips  
Poage  
Radwan  
Ray  
Reams  
Reece, Tenn.  
Reed, Ill.  
Reed, N. Y.  
Rees, Kans.  
Regan  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Riehlman  
Rogers, Mass.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Sadlak  
St. George  
Saylor  
Schenck  
Scherer  
Scrivner

Scudder  
Seely-Brown  
Shafer  
Sheehan  
Short  
Shuford  
Simpson, Ill.  
Simpson, Pa.  
Small  
Smith, Kans.  
Smith, Va.  
Smith, Wis.  
Stauffer  
Steed  
Taber  
Talle  
Thomas  
Thompson, Mich.  
Tollefson  
Tuck

Utt  
Van Pelt  
Van Zandt  
Velde  
Vorys  
Vursell  
Wainwright  
Warburton  
Welchel  
Westland  
Wharton  
Wigglesworth  
Williams, N. Y.  
Wilson, Calif.  
Wilson, Ind.  
Wilson, Tex.  
Wolcott  
Young  
Younger

## NOT VOTING—30

Angell  
Becker  
Brooks, La.  
Buckley  
Bush  
Case  
Coudert  
Delaney  
Dodd  
Dolliver

Elliott  
Forrester  
Gamble  
Grant  
Haley  
Hillings  
Hoeven  
Kearney  
Morrison  
Patman

Pillion  
Poulson  
Rains  
Secrest  
Springer  
Stringfellow  
Taylor  
Thompson, La.  
Whitten  
Winstead

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Poulson with Mr. Morrison.  
Mr. Pillion with Mr. Delaney.  
Mr. Gamble with Mr. Buckley.  
Mr. Angell with Mr. Brooks of Louisiana.  
Mr. Becker with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.  
Mr. Bush with Mr. Rains.  
Mr. Case with Mr. Elliott.  
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Grant.  
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Forrester.  
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Haley.  
Mr. Hoeven with Mr. Dodd.  
Mr. Springer with Mr. Patman.  
Mr. Stringfellow with Mr. Secrest.  
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Winstead.  
Mr. Hillings with Mr. Whitten.

Mr. WHEELER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 395, nays 2, answered "present" 1, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

## YEAS—395

Abbitt  
Abernethy  
Adair  
Addonizio  
Albert  
Alexander  
Allen, Calif.  
Allen, Ill.  
Andersen,  
H. Carl  
Andresen,  
August H.  
Andrews  
Arends  
Aspinall  
Auchincloss  
Ayres  
Bailey  
Baker  
Barden  
Barrett  
Bates  
Battle  
Beamer  
Belcher  
Bender  
Bennett, Fla.  
Bennett, Mich.

Bentley  
Bentsen  
Berry  
Betts  
Bishop  
Blatnik  
Boggs  
Boland  
Bolling  
Bolton,  
Frances P.  
Bolton,  
Oliver P.  
Bonin  
Bonner  
Bosch  
Bow  
Boykin  
Bramblett  
Bray  
Brooks, Tex.  
Brown, Ga.  
Brown, Ohio  
Brownson  
Broyhill  
Buchanan  
Budge  
Burlison

Busbey  
Byrd  
Byrne, Pa.  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canfield  
Cannon  
Carlyle  
Carnahan  
Carrigg  
Cederberg  
Celler  
Chatham  
Chelf  
Chenoweth  
Chiperfield  
Chudoff  
Church  
Clardy  
Clevenger  
Cole, Mo.  
Cole, N. Y.  
Colmer  
Condon  
Cooley  
Coon  
Cooper  
Corbett

Cotton  
Cretella  
Cresser  
Crumpacker  
Cunningham  
Curtis, Mass.  
Curtis, Mo.  
Curtis, Nebr.  
Dague  
Davis, Ga.  
Davis, Tenn.  
Davis, Wis.  
Dawson, Ill.  
Dawson, Utah  
Deane  
Delaney  
Dempsey  
Derounian  
Devereux  
D'Ewart  
Dies  
Dingell  
Dollinger  
Dondero  
Donohue  
Donovan  
Dorn, N. Y.  
Dorn, S. C.  
Dowdy  
Doyle  
Durham  
Eberharter  
Edmondson  
Ellsworth  
Engle  
Evins  
Fallon  
Felghan  
Fenton  
Fernandez  
Fine  
Fino  
Fisher  
Forand  
Ford  
Fountain  
Frazier  
Frelinghuysen  
Friedel  
Fulton  
Gamble  
Garmatz  
Gary  
Gathings  
Gavin  
Gentry  
George  
Golden  
Goodwin  
Gordon  
Graham  
Granahan  
Green  
Gregory  
Gross  
Gubser  
Gwinn  
Hagen, Calif.  
Hagen, Minn.  
Hale  
Halleck  
Hand  
Harden  
Hardy  
Harris  
Harrison, Nebr.  
Harrison, Va.  
Harrison, Wyo.  
Hart  
Harvey  
Hays, Ark.  
Hays, Ohio  
Hébert  
Heller  
Herlong  
Heseltun  
Hess  
Hiestand  
Hill  
Hillelson  
Hinshaw  
Hoffman, Ill.  
Hoffman, Mich.  
Hollifield  
Holmes  
Holt  
Holtzman  
Hope  
Horan  
Hosmer  
Howell  
Hruska  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Ikard  
Jackson

James  
Jarman  
Javits  
Jenkins  
Jensen  
Johnson  
Jonas, Ill.  
Jonas, N. C.  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Jones, N. C.  
Judd  
Karsten, Mo.  
Kean  
Kearns  
Keating  
Kee  
Kelley, Pa.  
Kelly, N. Y.  
Keogh  
Kersten, Wis.  
Kilburn  
Kilday  
King, Calif.  
King, Pa.  
Kirwan  
Klein  
Kluczynski  
Knox  
Krueger  
Laird  
Landrum  
Lane  
Lanham  
Lantaff  
Latham  
LeCompte  
Lesinski  
Long  
Lovre  
Lucas  
Lyle  
McCarthy  
McConnell  
McCormack  
McCulloch  
McDonough  
McGregor  
McIntire  
McMillan  
McVey  
Machrowicz  
Mack, Ill.  
Mack, Wash.  
Madden  
Magnuson  
Mahon  
Malliard  
Marshall  
Martin, Iowa  
Mason  
Matthews  
Meador  
Merrill  
Merrow  
Metcalf  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Kans.  
Miller, Md.  
Miller, Nebr.  
Miller, N. Y.  
Mills  
Mollohan  
Morano  
Morgan  
Moss  
Moulder  
Multer  
Mumma  
Murray  
Neal  
Nelson  
Nicholson  
Norblad  
Norrell  
Oakman  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, Mich.  
O'Brien, N. Y.  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Hara, Minn.  
O'Neill  
Osmer  
Ostertag  
Passman  
Patten  
Patterson  
Pelly  
Perkins  
Pfost  
Philbin  
Phillips  
Pilcher  
Poage  
Poff  
Polk

Powell  
Preston  
Price  
Priest  
Prouty  
Rabaut  
Radwan  
Ray  
Rayburn  
Reams  
Reed, Ill.  
Rees, Kans.  
Regan  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Richards  
Riehlman  
Riley  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Robeson, Va.  
Robson, Ky.  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Mass.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rooney  
Roosevelt  
Sadlak  
St. George  
Saylor  
Schenck  
Scherer  
Scott  
Scrivner  
Scudder  
Seely-Brown  
Selden  
Shafer  
Sheehan  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Short  
Shuford  
Sieminski  
Sikes  
Simpson, Ill.  
Simpson, Pa.  
Small  
Smith, Kans.  
Smith, Miss.  
Smith, Va.  
Spence  
Staggers  
Stauffer  
Steed  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Taber  
Talle  
Teague  
Thomas  
Thompson, Mich.  
Thompson, Tex.  
Thornberry  
Tollefson  
Trimble  
Tuck  
Utt  
Van Zandt  
Velde  
Vinson  
Vorys  
Vursell  
Wainwright  
Walter  
Wampler  
Warburton  
Watts  
Welchel  
Westland  
Wharton  
Wheeler  
Whitten  
Wickersham  
Widnall  
Wier  
Wigglesworth  
Williams, Miss.  
Williams, N. Y.  
Willis  
Wilson, Calif.  
Wilson, Ind.  
Wilson, Tex.  
Withrow  
Wolcott  
Wolverton  
Yates  
Yorty  
Young  
Younger  
Zablocki

## NAYS—2

Smith, Wis. Van Pelt

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Fogarty

## NOT VOTING—32

Angell  
Becker  
Brooks, La.  
Buckley  
Burdick  
Bush  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Case  
Coudert  
Dodd  
Dolliver

Elliott  
Forrester  
Grant  
Haley  
Hillings  
Hoeven  
Kearney  
Morrison  
O'Konski  
Patman  
Pillion

Poulson  
Rains  
Reece, Tenn.  
Reed, N. Y.  
Secrest  
Springer  
Stringfellow  
Taylor  
Thompson, La.  
Winstead

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Morrison.  
Mr. Stringfellow with Mr. Elliott.  
Mr. Beck with Mr. Grant.  
Mr. Angell with Mr. Rains.  
Mr. Hillings with Mr. Haley.  
Mr. Springer with Mr. Secrest.  
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.  
Mr. Hoeven with Mr. Brooks of Louisiana.  
Mr. Bush with Mr. Winstead.  
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Forrester.  
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Dodd.  
Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. Buckley.  
Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Patman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, rollcall No. 43 shows that I did not answer when my name was called. I was present and answered to my name and I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record be corrected to show that I was present on that rollcall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

## WORK OF THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

(Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, as we know, the investigating procedures of certain committees of this Congress have occasioned comment recently on the other side of the Atlantic as well as in this country. Some of these comments have generated more heat than light. The work of the House Un-American Activities Committee was recently subjected to a searching scrutiny by a writer assigned especially to this task by the Sunday Times of London, and in this instance, I am glad to say, the resultant articles produced light.

The author of the articles, Miss Rebecca West, is an eminent figure in all English-speaking literary circles, renowned for her history of Yugoslavia, entitled "Black Lamb and Gray Falcon"; for her biography of the wartime British traitor, William Joyce—Lord Haw Haw—The Meaning of Treason; and for articles in American periodicals, including Harper's magazine which has termed her the world's greatest reporter. The



articles on the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee by this eminent and disinterested author, Mr. Speaker, constitute a valuable and most interesting commentary on the committee's work. I cannot, of course, vouch for the accuracy of all of Miss West's statements and interpretations. As I have said, however, the articles did shed light. I therefore request permission for their publication in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Collectively, I believe they will take up in excess of two pages, so I shall have the first article included in today's RECORD and the second and third articles will follow in tomorrow's RECORD with permission of the Speaker.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

#### CORRECTION OF THE ROLL CALL

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that on the first roll call today the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] was recorded as voting. The gentleman, I understand, is burying his father today. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY YEAR OF CONTROLLED POWERED FLIGHT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to Public Law 32, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Observance of the 50th Anniversary Year of Controlled Powered Flight the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota, Mr. SCHENCK, Mr. BONNER, Mr. PRIEST, and Mr. MACK of Illinois.

#### CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 244 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R.

5376) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any provisions contained in said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption by this body of House Resolution 244 which would make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 5376. This bill makes appropriations for civil functions, Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.

The Committee on Rules has granted an open rule waiving points of order against the bill and they have provided for 3 hours of general debate on the bill itself.

Breaking down H. R. 5376 into sections, the bill provides appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control, trust fund appropriations for the United States Soldiers' Home and appropriations for the Canal Zone government for the fiscal year of 1954.

In terms of good economical government, this bill, if passed proposes to save the American taxpayer millions of dollars. The initial budget estimates submitted to the Committee on Appropriations asked for an appropriation of \$683,377,100. The revised budget estimate asked for an appropriation of \$498,650,100, which represented a reduction of \$184,727,000 over the original figure.

The Committee on Appropriations, however, now recommends in this bill an appropriation of \$415,991,600, which is \$267,385,500 below the initial estimate and \$82,658,500 less than the amount recommended in the revised budget estimate. If this appropriation bill is passed, it will represent a saving of \$168,075,000 over what was appropriated for the current fiscal year.

If you consider the proposed legislation in terms of percent, the results are even more revealing. The current bill calls for an appropriation that would represent a saving of 39 percent over the original estimate submitted and approximately 16 percent over the revised estimate. H. R. 5376 recommends an appropriation that is 29 percent less than the amount appropriated last year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this House Resolution 244 which would make in order the consideration of this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule on this side and I have no requests for time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5376) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5376, with Mr. HOPE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

(Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, in fulfilling my responsibility of bringing the Army civil functions appropriation bill to the floor for the consideration of the House of Representatives, I perform that act with considerable pride, if not with a great deal of pleasure. This is not the kind of legislation particularly designed to please. I bring this bill here with pride because I believe that under all of the circumstances the subcommittee has done a good job.

The major credit for the subcommittee's accomplishment should be given in two places: First of all, the executive clerk of our subcommittee, Frank Sanders, has done what I consider to be a remarkable job in furnishing the subcommittee with the information we require in order to act with judgment upon the many requests that came before us. He spent a great deal of time in the adjournment period making on-the-spot inspections of various projects throughout the country. He has furnished us with a great deal of information as a result of those inspections. He has done a great deal of work with the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget in working out a new and more informational format for the presentation of this material. He has brought a printed record and a report here which, I think, are understandable to those who search for information on specific projects.

Secondly, I should like to give a great deal of credit to the members of the subcommittee, who worked with faithful diligence, with great harmony, and with admirable self-denial in the consideration of the various projects that came before us.

This bill has traditionally been the subject of a great deal of logrolling and back-scratching. Surely the temptation existed with the members of the subcommittee to help each other out, shall we say? For certainly every member of the subcommittee was interested and vitally interested in projects affecting their State or their part of the country. But you will not find any projects











83<sup>D</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 5246

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 27 (legislative day, MAY 21), 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

1        *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2        *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3        That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4        in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-  
5        ments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and  
6        related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June  
7        30, 1954, namely:



## 1 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

## 2 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
4 Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title re-  
5 ferred to as the Secretary), including services as authorized  
6 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.  
7 55a) ; teletype news service; any payment in advance when  
8 authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library  
9 membership in organizations whose publications are avail-  
10 able to members only or to members at a price lower than to  
11 the general public; \$1,250,000.

## 12 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

13 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
14 Office of the Solicitor, \$1,350,000: *Provided*, That the com-  
15 pensation of the Solicitor shall be \$14,800 per annum.

## 16 BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

17 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
18 promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and  
19 amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; per-  
20 formance of safety functions of the Secretary under the  
21 Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5  
22 U. S. C. 784 (c) ) ; performance of the functions vested in  
23 the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations  
24 Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g) ) ; and not to ex-  
25 ceed \$70,000 for the work of the President's Committee on



1 National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as au-  
2 thorized by the Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), in-  
3 cluding purchase of reports and of material for informational  
4 exhibits; \$624,000.

5 BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

6 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to render  
7 assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment  
8 rights under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service  
9 Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App 308), the Serv-  
10 ice Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army Reserve  
11 and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as amended,  
12 and section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Serv-  
13 ice Act, and, under the Act of June 23, 1943, as amended  
14 (50 U. S. C. App. 1472), of persons who have performed  
15 service in the Merchant Marine, \$300,000.

16 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

17 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to en-  
18 able the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging  
19 apprentice training, as authorized by the Act of August 16,  
20 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50), \$3,400,000.

21 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

22 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
23 general administration of the employment service and un-  
24 employment compensation programs, including temporary  
25 employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service



1 laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program;  
2 and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by sec-  
3 tion 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);  
4 \$5,100,000, of which \$981,000 shall be for carrying into  
5 effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the  
6 Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

7 Grants to States for unemployment compensation and  
8 employment service administration: For grants in accord-  
9 ance with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as  
10 amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect  
11 section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944,  
12 for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the  
13 Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503),  
14 including, upon the request of any State, the purchase of  
15 equipment and the payment of rental for space made avail-  
16 able to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose,  
17 for necessary expenses in connection with the operation of  
18 employment office facilities and services in the District of  
19 Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for,  
20 necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjust-  
21 ment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684), \$187,300,-  
22 000, of which \$10,000,000 shall be available only to  
23 the extent that the Secretary finds necessary to meet in-  
24 creased costs of administration resulting from changes in  
25 a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed



1 and claims paid over those upon which the State's  
2 basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Co-  
3 lumbia) was based, which increased costs of administra-  
4 tion cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjust-  
5 ments: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision to  
6 the contrary in section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act,  
7 as amended, the Secretary of Labor shall from time to time  
8 certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to  
9 each State found to be in compliance with the requirements  
10 of the Act of June 6, 1933, and, except in the case of  
11 Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, with the provisions of  
12 section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such  
13 amounts as he determines to be necessary for the proper and  
14 efficient administration of its unemployment compensation  
15 law and of its public employment offices: *Provided further*,  
16 That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Depart-  
17 ment of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be used  
18 for the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly  
19 determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail  
20 matter in connection with the administration of unemploy-  
21 ment compensation systems and employment services by  
22 States receiving grants herefrom.

23 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,  
24 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social  
25 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and



1 maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall  
2 apply.

3       None of the funds appropriated by this title to the  
4 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State  
5 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation  
6 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of offi-  
7 cers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from  
8 the said agencies of any States which have established by  
9 legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system  
10 and classification and compensation plan covering the selec-  
11 tion, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees,  
12 because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner  
13 of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the  
14 rates of pay of said officers or employees.

15       Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-  
16 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to  
17 States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended,  
18 and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first  
19 quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may  
20 be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures  
21 made thereunder for payments under such title and under  
22 such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the appropriation  
23 therefor for that fiscal year.

24       Unemployment compensation for veterans: For pay-  
25 ments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV



1 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952,  
2 \$41,000,000.

3 Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program: For  
4 expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out  
5 the functions of the Department of Labor under the Act of  
6 July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78), including temporary em-  
7 ployment of persons without regard to the civil service laws,  
8 \$1,250,000.

9 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

10 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative  
11 expenses and not to exceed \$87,000 for the Employees'  
12 Compensation Appeals Board, \$2,000,000, together with  
13 not to exceed \$90,000 to be derived from the War Claims  
14 Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of  
15 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

16 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of  
17 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except ad-  
18 ministrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing dur-  
19 ing the current or any prior fiscal year, including payments  
20 to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital services  
21 pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of Em-  
22 ployees' Compensation; continuation of payment of bene-  
23 fits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits"  
24 in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947;  
25 the advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in



1 third-party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital  
2 services and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial ex-  
3 penses, including transportation and other expenses in-  
4 cidental to such services, treatment, and burial, for such  
5 enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified  
6 by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital services  
7 and treatment at Government expense on June 30, 1943,  
8 and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian em-  
9 ployees of the United States, and the limitations and  
10 authority of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended  
11 (5 U. S. C. 796), shall apply in providing such services,  
12 treatment, and expenses in such cases; such amount as  
13 may be required during the current fiscal year: *Provided*,  
14 That this appropriation shall be available for payments pur-  
15 suant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of the War Claims Act  
16 of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012) and shall be credited with  
17 advances or reimbursements therefor from the War Claims  
18 Fund created by section 13 (a) of said War Claims Act of  
19 1948.

20 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

21 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
22 work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement  
23 to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for  
24 services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for services



1 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
2 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$5,250,000.

3 WOMEN'S BUREAU

4 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
5 work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of  
6 June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of  
7 reports and material for informational exhibits, \$360,000.

8 WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

9 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for per-  
10 forming the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act  
11 of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions for  
12 the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the  
13 United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41  
14 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State,  
15 Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspec-  
16 tion services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for expenses  
17 of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at con-  
18 ferences concerned with the work of the Division, \$6,000,000.

19 GENERAL PROVISIONS

20 SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for  
21 salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic  
22 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
23 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), for examination of esti-



1 mates of appropriations in the field, and for expenses of  
2 attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activ-  
3 ity for which any such appropriation is made.

4 This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor  
5 Appropriation Act, 1954".

6 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
7 EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

8 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

9 Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of  
10 August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), \$175,000.

11 COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

12 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of  
13 Columbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal serv-  
14 ices and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improve-  
15 ments, \$410,000: *Provided*, That the Columbia Institution  
16 for the Deaf, shall be paid by the District of Columbia, in  
17 advance at the beginning of each quarter, at the rate of  
18 \$1,150 per school year for each student attending said In-  
19 stitution pursuant to the Act of March 1, 1901 (31 D. C.  
20 Code 1008).

21 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

22 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for car-  
23 rying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as  
24 amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392) ; the Tea Importation Act,  
25 as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50) ; the Import Milk Act



1 (21 U. S. C. 141-149) ; the Federal Caustic Poison Act  
2 (15 U. S. C. 401-411) ; and the Filled Milk Act, as  
3 amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64) ; reporting and illustrating  
4 the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, appa-  
5 ratus, and scientific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for  
6 payment in advance for special test and analyses by contract;  
7 and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection with  
8 studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug  
9 enforcement operations; \$5,000,000.

10 Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection serv-  
11 ices: For expenses necessary for the certification or in-  
12 spection of certain products in accordance with sections  
13 406, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food,  
14 Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346,  
15 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of  
16 the advance deposits during the current fiscal year to cover  
17 payment of fees by applicants for certification or inspection  
18 of such products, to remain available until expended. The  
19 total amount herein appropriated shall be available for  
20 personal services; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and  
21 scientific equipment; and the refund of advance deposits  
22 for which no service has been rendered.

#### 23 FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

24 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for opera-  
25 tion and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repair-



1 ing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in  
2 the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to  
3 the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard Univer-  
4 sity" for salaries of technical and professional personnel de-  
5 tailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of  
6 Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and power  
7 furnished by such university; \$3,104,000: *Provided*, That  
8 no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from  
9 this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compen-  
10 sation in the form of wages or salary from any other appro-  
11 priation in this title: *Provided further*, That the District of  
12 Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon  
13 the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning  
14 of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General cal-  
15 culates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the  
16 Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the  
17 District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon Gen-  
18 eral on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to  
19 audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper  
20 adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on  
21 the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of  
22 each quarter: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General  
23 may delegate the responsibilities imposed upon him by the  
24 foregoing proviso.



## HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Howard University, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds, \$2,535,000.

Construction of buildings: For the purchase and installation of a vacuum pump in the steam system, \$20,000.

## OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Promotion and further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15), section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30), and the Act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462), \$18,673,261: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$18,498,261 for the current fiscal year.

Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended, \$2,501,500.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of public and school library service; coordination of library service on the national level with other forms of adult educa-



tion; developing library participation in Federal projects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research materials among libraries, interstate library coordination and the development of library service throughout the country; purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education, and repairing the same; \$2,500,000: *Provided*, That all receipts from non-Federal agencies representing reimbursement for expenses of travel of employees of the Office of Education performing advisory functions to the said agencies shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of this appropriation.

Payments to school districts: For payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), \$66,500,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of such Act.

#### OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska,



1 Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Voca-  
2 tional Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4),  
3 including payments, in accordance with regulations of the  
4 Secretary, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the  
5 acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accord-  
6 ance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for the use of  
7 blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be con-  
8 trolled by the State agency, \$23,000,000, of which not to  
9 exceed \$175,000 shall be available to the Secretary for provid-  
10 ing rehabilitation services to disabled residents of the District  
11 of Columbia, as authorized by section 6 of said Act, which  
12 latter amount shall be available for administrative expenses  
13 in connection with providing such services in the District  
14 of Columbia: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15 per centum  
15 of the appropriation shall be used for administrative purposes.

16 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and  
17 Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making,  
18 after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States  
19 in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as  
20 amended (including the objects specified in the preceding  
21 paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding  
22 fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations  
23 incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be  
24 charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year:



1 *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this para-  
2 graph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the  
3 first quarter of the current fiscal year.

4 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in car-  
5 rying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,  
6 as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20  
7 U. S. C., ch. 6A) , including not to exceed \$3,000 for pro-  
8 duction, purchase, and distribution of educational films;  
9 \$690,000.

10 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

11 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public Health  
12 Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) (hereinafter  
13 referred to as the Act) , and other Acts, including expenses  
14 for active commissioned officers in the Reserve Corps and  
15 for not to exceed one thousand five hundred commissioned  
16 officers in the Regular Corps; as follows:

17 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sec-  
18 tions 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal  
19 diseases including the operation and maintenance of centers  
20 for the diagnosis and treatment of persons afflicted with  
21 venereal diseases; and for grants of money, services, sup-  
22 plies, equipment, and use of facilities to States, as defined  
23 in the Act, and with the approval of the respective State  
24 health authorities, to counties, health districts, and other  
25 political subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes,



1 in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the  
2 Surgeon General may determine; \$5,000,000.

3 Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314  
4 (b) of the Act, \$5,725,000.

5 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes,  
6 not otherwise specifically provided for, of section 314 (c) of  
7 the Act; to provide consultative services to States pursuant  
8 to section 311 of the Act; to make field investigations and  
9 demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the Act; and to  
10 provide for collecting and compiling mortality, morbidity,  
11 and vital statistics; \$13,250,000.

12 Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as other-  
13 wise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311,  
14 and 361 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppres-  
15 sion of communicable and preventable diseases, and the inter-  
16 state transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase,  
17 erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; and hire,  
18 maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$5,000,000.

19 Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For  
20 expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out  
21 those provisions of sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of  
22 the Act relating to sanitation and other aspects of environ-  
23 mental health, including enforcement of applicable quaran-  
24 tine laws and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carry-



1 ing out the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act  
2 (33 U. S. C. 466-466 (j) ) ; \$3,000,000.

3 Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Ter-  
4 ritory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct,  
5 in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Terri-  
6 tory of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the  
7 investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases,  
8 and the establishment and maintenance of health and sani-  
9 tation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in  
10 sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of  
11 subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set  
12 forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361 and 363 of the  
13 Act, including the hire, operation, and maintenance of air-  
14 craft, and the purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable  
15 buildings, \$1,082,000.

16 Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hos-  
17 pital construction under part C, title VI, of the Act, as  
18 amended, to remain available until expended, \$50,000,000:  
19 *Provided*, That allotments under such part C to the several  
20 States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis  
21 of an amount equal to the appropriation granted herein.

22 Grants for hospital construction (liquidation of contract  
23 authorization) : For payment of obligations incurred under  
24 authority heretofore granted under this head, \$19,700,000.

25 Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:



1 For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI  
2 of the Act, as amended, \$750,000.

3 Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the func-  
4 tions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August 8,  
5 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), and under sections 321, 322, 324,  
6 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the  
7 Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079  
8 of February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of  
9 farm products and livestock; conducting research on tech-  
10 nical nursing standards and furnishing consultative nursing  
11 services; and purchase of firearms and ammunition; \$32,-  
12 500,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall be exclusively available  
13 for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care and treat-  
14 ment of persons afflicted with leprosy: *Provided*, That when  
15 the Public Health Service establishes or operates a health  
16 service program for any department or agency, payment for  
17 the estimated cost shall be made in advance for deposit to  
18 the credit of this appropriation.

19 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-  
20 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to preventing  
21 the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign coun-  
22 tries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance with  
23 section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of  
24 quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the Act  
25 in private or other public hospitals when facilities of the



1 Public Health Service are not available, including insurance  
2 of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required  
3 by law of such countries; \$2,900,000.

4 National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For  
5 the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not other-  
6 wise provided for, including research fellowships and grants  
7 for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act; not to  
8 exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visiting scientists when  
9 specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection of  
10 temporary structures; and grants of therapeutic and chemical  
11 substances for demonstrations and research; \$4,675,000:  
12 *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to advance  
13 to this appropriation from other appropriations to the Public  
14 Health Service such amounts as are determined to be neces-  
15 sary for the foregoing purposes and for activities performed  
16 on a centralized basis: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon  
17 General is authorized to operate facilities at the National  
18 Institutes of Health for the sale of meals to employees and  
19 others and the proceeds thereof may be credited to this  
20 appropriation.

21 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon Gen-  
22 eral, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory  
23 Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and train-  
24 ing projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State  
25 health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit in-



stitutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer by providing consultative services, demonstrations, and grants-in-aid; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A, of the Act; \$17,887,000.

Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311, 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases, \$10,895,000.

National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act, \$12,000,000.

Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental diseases and conditions, \$1,650,000.

Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, \$5,000,000.

Microbiology activities: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to microbiology, including the regulation and preparation of biologic products, \$5,479,200.

Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to neurology and blindness, \$4,000,000.



1       Construction of research facilities (liquidation of contract  
2 authorization): For payment of obligations incurred pur-  
3 suant to authority granted to enter into contracts for con-  
4 struction of a combined hospital and research building as  
5 authorized in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation  
6 Acts of 1949 and 1950, to be transferred to the General  
7 Services Administration, \$2,500,000.

8       Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay  
9 of commissioned officers, as authorized by law, \$1,197,000, to  
10 remain available until expended: *Provided*, That hereafter  
11 a commissioned officer of the Public Health Service who has  
12 been retired may be recalled to active duty, other than in  
13 time of war, with his consent.

14       Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of  
15 the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous  
16 expenses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for  
17 elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and pub-  
18 lications related to public health; conducting studies and  
19 demonstrations in public health methods; and carrying on  
20 international health activities, including not to exceed \$1,000  
21 for entertainment of officials of other countries when specifi-  
22 cally authorized by the Surgeon General; \$2,900,000.

23       Service and supply fund: For additional working capital  
24 for the "Service and supply fund," created by title II of the  
25 Act of July 3, 1945 (42 U. S. C. 231), not to exceed



1 \$200,000, to be derived by transfer from such other funds  
2 appropriated in this Act to the National Institutes of Health  
3 as the Surgeon General may determine, to remain available  
4 until expended: *Provided*, That any stocks of supplies and  
5 equipment of the Public Health Service related to services  
6 financed under this fund may also be used to capitalize said  
7 fund.

8       Administrative provisions: During the current fiscal  
9 year, and with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,  
10 there may be transferred from any annual appropriation to  
11 the Public Health Service to any other such appropriation  
12 such additional amounts as may be required for pay and  
13 allowances of the active commissioned officers herein au-  
14 thorized, but any amounts so transferred shall not exceed  
15 5 per centum of any such appropriation and no such appro-  
16 priation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum as a  
17 result of any such transfers.

18                   SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

19       Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
20 maintenance and operation of the hospital, including pur-  
21 chase of clothing for patients and cooperation with organ-  
22 izations or individuals in scientific research into the nature,  
23 causes, prevention and treatment of mental illness,  
24 \$2,417,000.

25       Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds:



1 For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and  
2 equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including prep-  
3 aration of plans and specifications, advertising, and super-  
4 vision of construction, \$399,500: *Provided*, That any part  
5 of this amount may be transferred to the General Services  
6 Administration.

7 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

8 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors  
9 Insurance: For necessary expenses, including furnishing,  
10 repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equipment  
11 used by building guards; not more than \$62,750,000 may  
12 be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insur-  
13 ance trust fund.

14 Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insur-  
15 ance: For beginning construction of an office building and  
16 appurtenant facilities for the Bureau of Old-Age and Sur-  
17 vivors Insurance, including equipment, acquisition of land  
18 (including donations thereof), and preparation of plans and  
19 specifications, \$1,500,000, to be derived from the Federal  
20 old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and to remain  
21 available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations for  
22 the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to the General  
23 Services Administration, but the selection of the site and the  
24 building plans shall be subject to approval by the Secretary:  
25 *Provided further*, That the total cost of the project herein



1 authorized shall not exceed \$27,000,000, but this limita-  
2 tion may be exceeded, or shall be reduced, by an amount  
3 equal to the percentage increase or decrease, if any, in con-  
4 struction costs generally dating from January 1, 1953, as  
5 determined by the Administrator of General Services.

6 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to  
7 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid  
8 to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled,  
9 as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social  
10 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV,  
11 X, and XIV), \$1,340,000,000, of which such amount as  
12 may be necessary shall be available for grants for any period  
13 in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year.

14 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance:  
15 For expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance,  
16 \$1,600,000.

17 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary  
18 expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as  
19 amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6), and title V of the Social  
20 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),  
21 including purchase of reports and material for the publica-  
22 tions of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution,  
23 \$1,500,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation  
24 contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry  
25 out any instructions, order, or regulation relating to the care



1 of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons  
2 licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided*  
3 *further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed  
4 as to prevent any patient from having the services of any  
5 practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so  
6 long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*,  
7 That any State plan which provides standards for profes-  
8 sional obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the  
9 State shall be approved.

10 Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For  
11 grants to States for maternal and child-health services, serv-  
12 ices for crippled children, and child-welfare services as  
13 authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security  
14 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),  
15 \$30,000,000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pur-  
16 suant to section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not  
17 be included in computing for the purposes of subsections (a)  
18 and (b) of sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount  
19 expended or estimated to be expended by the State.

20 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For  
21 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner for  
22 Social Security, \$173,000, together with not to exceed  
23 \$123,500 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and  
24 survivors insurance trust fund.

25 Operating fund, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions: For



1 additional working capital for the fund established by section  
2 5 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U. S. C. 1755),  
3 \$250,000, to be available for the purposes of such fund  
4 without fiscal year limitation: *Provided*, That this amount  
5 shall be treated as a loan to such fund and shall bear interest,  
6 payable annually, at a rate determined by the Secretary of  
7 the Treasury after taking into consideration the average rate  
8 of interest payable upon all marketable interest-bearing obli-  
9 gations of the United States: *Provided further*, That begin-  
10 ning not later than July 1, 1955, such amount shall be paid  
11 from such fund into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts  
12 at an annual rate of not less than one-tenth of such amount.

13 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-  
14 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to  
15 States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respectively, of  
16 the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter  
17 of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be neces-  
18 sary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made  
19 thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be  
20 charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

21 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, re-  
22 spectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, payments  
23 to a State under any of such titles for any quarter in the period  
24 beginnning April 1 of the prior year, and ending June 30  
25 of the current year, may be made with respect to a State



1 plan approved under such title prior to or during such period,  
2 but no such payment shall be made with respect to any  
3 plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which such plan  
4 was submitted for approval.

5 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

6 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For ex-  
7 penses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, \$1,075,000,  
8 together with not to exceed \$168,000 to be transferred from  
9 the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

10 Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services: For  
11 expenses necessary for the Office of Field Services, \$1,835,-  
12 000, together with not to exceed \$375,000 to be transferred  
13 from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

14 Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel:  
15 For expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel,  
16 \$350,000, together with not to exceed \$20,000 to be  
17 transferred from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses,  
18 certification and inspection services", and not to exceed  
19 \$355,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and  
20 survivors insurance trust fund.

21 Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for  
22 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k)  
23 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act  
24 of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal



1 excess property for educational purposes and protection of  
2 public health, \$450,000.

3           REDUCTIONS IN CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

4       The contract authorization granted under the head  
5 “National Heart Institute”, in the Federal Security Agency  
6 Appropriation Act, 1950, is hereby reduced by the amount  
7 of \$3,124.

8       The contract authorization granted under the head “Con-  
9 struction of research facilities, Public Health Service” in  
10 title II of the Federal Security Appropriation Act of 1950  
11 is hereby reduced by the sum of \$800,000.

12           REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

13       Amounts available from appropriations are hereby re-  
14 duced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be  
15 carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury  
16 immediately upon the approval of this Act, except as other-  
17 wise indicated:

18       “Grants to States, municipalities, etc., for plan prepara-  
19 tion, water pollution control”, \$200,000;

20       “Research facilities, National Institute of Dental  
21 Research” Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1950,  
22 \$23,573.49;

23       “Payments to States for surveys and programs for hos-



1 pital construction": The balance remaining unexpended on  
2 the date of approval of this Act;

3 "Grants for surveys and school construction": The bal-  
4 ance of the amount appropriated under section 101 of Public  
5 Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, second session (which sum  
6 was included under this head in chapter V of the Supple-  
7 mental Appropriation Act of 1951), which is unexpended  
8 on the date of approval of this Act.

9 GENERAL PROVISIONS

10 SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for  
11 salaries and expenses shall be available for examination of  
12 estimates of appropriations in the field, and for payment in  
13 advance for dues or fees for library membership in organiza-  
14 tions whose publications are available to members only or  
15 to members at a price lower than to the general public.

16 SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for  
17 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as au-  
18 thorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
19 U. S. C. 55a).

20 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for  
21 salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses  
22 and not to exceed \$25,000 of such funds shall be available  
23 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the  
24 functions or activities for which such appropriations are  
25 made.



SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated by this title to the Social Security Administration for grants in aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

13 SEC. 206. The Secretary is authorized to make such  
14 transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices,  
15 without transfer of funds, as may be required in carrying  
16 out the operations of the Department.

17 This title may be cited as the “Department of Health,  
18 Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1954”.

19 TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS  
20 BOARD

21       Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
22       National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions  
23       vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947  
24       (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses  
25       of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the



1 Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the  
 2 General Counsel; and services as authorized by section 15  
 3 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$9,000,-  
 4 000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be  
 5 available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural  
 6 laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings,  
 7 directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of  
 8 agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the  
 9 Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450) , and as amended by the  
 10 Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as defined in  
 11 sections 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1060) ,  
 12 and including in said definition employees engaged in the  
 13 maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and  
 14 waterways when maintained or operated on a mutual, non-  
 15 profit basis and at least 95 per centum of the water stored  
 16 or supplied thereby is used for farming purposes.

17 This title may be cited as the “National Labor Relations  
 18 Board Appropriation Act, 1954”.

#### 19 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
 21 National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting  
 22 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
 23 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) , \$429,000.

24 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses neces-  
 25 sary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of the



1 Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157), and  
2 emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant to  
3 section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including steno-  
4 graphic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the  
5 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$138,000.

6 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

7 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
8 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic  
9 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
10 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$497,000, of which not  
11 less than \$200,000 shall be available for compensation (at  
12 rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of referees  
13 appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act,  
14 as amended.

15 This title may be cited as the "National Mediation  
16 Board Appropriation Act, 1954".

17 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

18 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust  
19 fund): For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement  
20 Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of  
21 attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board  
22 when specifically authorized by the Board; and stenographic  
23 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act  
24 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$6,207,000, to be  
25 derived from the railroad retirement account.



1                   REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

2           Payment to railroad retirement account: Appropria-  
3 tions granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 and  
4 prior fiscal years are hereby reduced by the sum of  
5 \$18,656,682, which shall be carried to the surplus of the  
6 Treasury.

7           This title may be cited as the "Railroad Retirement  
8 Board Appropriation Act, 1954".

9                   TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND  
10                   CONCILIATION SERVICE

11          Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
12 Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-  
13 Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171-180,  
14 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel  
15 as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employ-  
16 ment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor  
17 relations at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses  
18 of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and indus-  
19 trial relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of  
20 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$3,200,000.

21          Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay  
22 necessary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the  
23 President pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management  
24 Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176-180, 182), including  
25 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,



1 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rent in the District of Columbia,  
2 \$10,000.

3 This title may be cited as the “Federal Mediation and  
4 Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1954”.

5 TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained  
7 in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of  
8 any person who engages in a strike against the Government  
9 of the United States or who is a member of an organization  
10 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike  
11 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-  
12 cates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the  
13 overthrow of the Government of the United States by force  
14 or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affi-  
15 davit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the per-  
16 son making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions  
17 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government  
18 of the United States, is not a member of an organization of  
19 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against  
20 the Government of the United States, or that such person  
21 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization  
22 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the  
23 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That  
24 any person who engages in a strike against the Government  
25 of the United States or who is a member of an organization



1 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike  
2 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-  
3 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,  
4 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by  
5 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or  
6 wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained  
7 in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction,  
8 shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not  
9 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the  
10 above penalty clause shall be in addition to; and not in  
11 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

12 SEC. 702. No part of any appropriation contained in this  
13 Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not  
14 authorized by the Congress.

15 SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this  
16 Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee  
17 engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that  
18 would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one  
19 hundred and five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and  
20 intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*,  
21 That for purposes of this section employees shall be consid-  
22 ered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time  
23 or more in personnel administration consisting of direction  
24 and administration of the personnel program; employment,  
25 placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification;



1 employee relations and services; training; committees of  
2 expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage  
3 administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

4 This Act may be cited as the “Departments of Labor and  
5 Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1954.”

Passed the House of Representatives May 26, 1953.

Attest:

LYLE O. SNADER,

*Clerk.*



---

## AN ACT

---

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

---

MAY 27 (legislative day, MAY 21), 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations









6/19/53

SENATE

7. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Subcommittee ordered reported to the full committee with amendments H. R. 5246, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1954 (p. D583).
8. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states: Mon., debate and vote on the conference report on S. 1081, economic controls bill; remainder of the week, S. 1901, submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, S. 2128, mutual security extension bill, and possibly H. R. 4828, Interior appropriation bill for 1954 (p. D585).

BILLS INTRODUCED

9. FLORICULTURAL PRODUCTS. H. R. 5847, by Rep. Haley, to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, so as to include certain floricultural products in the commodities to which the act applies; to Agriculture Committee (p. 7147).
10. MONOPOLIES. H. R. 5848, by Rep. Patman, to affirm the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, familiarly called antitrust laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; and to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; to Judiciary Committee (p. 7147).
11. TARIFF; WOOL. H. R. 5849, by Rep. Hunter, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, to encourage the domestic production of wool as a critical and strategic defense material; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 7147). Remarks of author (pp. A3821-2).
12. SURPLUS PROPERTY. H. R. 5852, by Rep. Lane, to authorize the President to donate surplus Federal property to individuals in a major disaster area; to Public Works Committee (p. 7147).
13. ROADS. H. R. 5857, providing for the construction of a highway and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to Public Works Committee (p. 7147).
14. PERSONNEL. H. R. 5863, by Rep. Fulton, to provide for the credit, upon retirement of an officer or employee from Government service, to the individual account of such officer or employee in the civil-service retirement and disability fund of a sum representing compensation for accumulated and current accrued sick leave; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 7147).

SENATE cont'd

15. APPROPRIATIONS. As reported (see Digest 111) H. R. 4828, the Interior appropriation bill for 1954 would increase Bonneville Power Administration by \$7,893,000, Bureau of Land Management by \$1,113,760, and Bureau of Reclamation by \$20,232,775. The Committee report disagrees with the statement in the House report requesting that none of the salt-water research item be used as grants to individuals, research or educational institutions.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

16. FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATOR. Rep. Albert inserted a Daily Ardmoreite editorial praising Dillard Lasseter, FHA Administrator (pp. A3806-07).



17. TRANSPORTATION. Rep. Wolverton inserted the letters and a listing of agricultural and other organizations, favoring H.R. 3203, the trip-leasing bill, as reported from the committee; Rep. Dolliver also extended his remarks in favor of this bill. (pp. A3807-09, A3811-14, A3829-30, A3833-35, A3837-40).
18. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Rep. Davis inserted a Badger Farm Bureau News editorial pointing out 5 ways to make dairying profitable (p. A3808).
19. FOREIGN AID. Extension of remarks by Rep. Boland in favor of H.R. 5710, mutual security extension bill, as reported by the committee (p. A3813).  
Extension of remarks by Rep. Wolverton urging a reexamination of the mutual security and foreign aid programs (p. A3815).  
Extension of remarks by Rep. Smith (Misc.) questioning the results of the American foreign aid program, and inserting excerpts from Walter Lippman's article claiming the "world has outgrown the European Policy which was worked out...in 1947" (pp. A3818, 3826).
20. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Rep. Van Zandt inserted a statement before the H. Public Works Committee opposing enactment of H. J. Res. 104, providing for a \$105 million Government St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (pp. A3817-18).
21. CENSUS. Rep. Rooney inserted an American Retail Federation memorandum urging restoration of funds for the censuses of business, manufactures, and agriculture, which the House had cut and the Senate restored in their consideration of H.R. 4974, Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill for 1954 (pp. 3825-26).
22. IMMIGRATION. Rep. Rooney inserted a Brooklyn Table article favoring S. 1917, providing for the admittance of 240,000 non-quota immigrants (pp. A3830-31).
23. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Javits inserted a Freeman article by Dr. N. I. Stone discussing the history of the reciprocal trade idea, and urging its continuation (pp. A3836-37).

-0-

FOREIGN AID (continued). "It is the intention of Congress, where feasible under this act, that the act shall be so administered that surplus foods, grains, and commodities now or hereafter held by the United States Government shall be substituted for other forms of economic aid specified in this act, and shall be paid for out of funds herein authorized."

-0-

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 105A.

-0-

# Daily Digest

## HIGHLIGHTS

House passed bill extending mutual security program.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

## Senate

### Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, June 22, at 12 noon.

### Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

#### APPROPRIATIONS—AIR FORCE

*Committee on Appropriations:* The Armed Services Subcommittee continued its executive hearings on proposed 1954 budget estimates for the Air Force, with testimony, as indicated, from the following AF representatives, accompanied by their associates:

On funds for aircraft and related procurement—Maj. Gen. M. J. Asensio, Director of Budget, DCS Comptroller, Col. John L. Zoeckler, Deputy Director for Aircraft Programing, DCS Materiel, and Col. Neil D. Van Sickle, Chief, Aircraft Programing, DCS Operations; and

On funds for major procurement other than aircraft—Brig. Gen. F. J. Dau, Deputy Director, Director of Supply and Services, Air Materiel Command.

Hearings continue June 22 with further testimony on funds for the Navy Department.

#### APPROPRIATIONS—LABOR—HEW

*Committee on Appropriations:* The Labor-HEW subcommittee completed marking up H. R. 5246, Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations for 1954, and ordered the bill favorably reported to the full committee, with amendments. Subcommittee adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

#### MINING CLAIMS

*Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:* Continuing hearings on S. 1397, to clarify the status of mining claims in area held under an oil and gas prospecting permit or lease and to encourage the exploration and development of fissionable source minerals, Subcommittee on Minerals and Fuels heard testimony from the following witnesses, all of whom agreed that clarifying legislation on this matter is needed: Robert S. Palmer, executive vice

president, Colorado Mining Association, Denver; John Liebert, Special Assistant to Assistant Secretary of Interior Wormser; Clarence R. Bradshaw, Assistant Chief Counsel, Interior Department; Jesse Johnson, Director, Raw Materials Division, AEC; and L. Dan Jones, Independent Petroleum Association. Mr. Liebert further stated that S. 1397 apparently would take care of the immediate need for clarifying oil and mineral rights but presented to the committee for its consideration a draft of a proposed bill on the general subject as prepared by the Interior Department.

#### CHIROPRACTIC TREATMENT FOR VETERANS

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee continued hearings on the question of Veterans' Administration authorizing chiropractic treatment for veterans, with testimony from the following witnesses: Adm. Joel T. Boone, Chief Medical Director, Department of Medicine and Surgery, H. V. Stirling, Acting Administrator, and Guy H. Birdsall, Assistant Administrator for Legislation, all of the VA; Dr. Leo Spears, head of the Spears Chiropractic Hospital, Denver; and Andrew Sardoni, secretary of commerce for the State of Pennsylvania. Subcommittee recessed subject to call.

#### NOMINATION

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee held further hearings on the nomination of James L. Guilmartin to be U. S. attorney for the southern district of Florida with favoring testimony from J. Edward Worton and James H. White, both from Miami, Neal Dunn, Coconut Grove, and Jacob Rasner, of New York City. Subcommittee recessed subject to call of the Chair.

#### FORT DES MOINES AND TEXAS LAND

*Committee on Public Works:* Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported, without amendment, H. R. 4823, to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas, and H. R. 4978, to repeal the act of 1950 authorizing the transfer to the State of Iowa of Fort Des Moines, Iowa. Committee also approved with technical amendment H. R. 5349, a private bill.



# House of Representatives

## Chamber Action

**Bills Introduced:** 19 public bills, H. R. 5845-5863; 12 private bills, H. R. 5864-5875; and 4 resolutions, H. J. Res. 281 and 282, and H. Res. 295 and 296, were introduced.

Pages 7147-7148

**Bills Reported:** One report was filed as follows: H. R. 5706, relating to civil-service appointments and related benefits for returning veterans (H. Rept. 628).

Page 7147

**Mutual Security:** Passed, by a rollcall vote of 280 yeas to 108 nays, H. R. 5710, to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, after rejecting a recommittal motion on a voice vote. This bill provides for a 1-year extension of the foreign-aid program.

As reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs this bill calls for appropriations of \$4,998 million, which figure is \$2,602 million under the budget estimates of the previous administration, and \$830 million less than the present administration's request.

Adopted clarifying committee amendments in addition to an amendment designed to stress language requiring the use of surplus U. S. commodities in the foreign-aid program.

Rejected amendments designed to—

Reduce authorizations for military assistance to Europe by striking out funds for Portugal, Spain, and Yugoslavia totaling \$329,186,000.

Withhold \$100,000 from authorization for military assistance to Yugoslavia.

Prevent any assistance for Yugoslavia.

Provide funds for individual nations who ratify the European Defense Community pact in lieu of withholding funds until all ratify it.

Cut \$115 million from authorization for military assistance to Asia and Pacific area.

Reduce the authorization for economic aid to Europe by \$70 million and \$100 million (two amendments).

Remove language providing \$100 million to pay for French manufacture of arms and ammunition.

Delete language increasing from 12 months to 24 months the period for terminating program after the expiration of the mutual security program.

Postpone the making of appropriations for foreign-aid program until January 1, 1954, and continue unexpended funds already appropriated.

Cut off carryover funds of Yugoslavia.

Impose a \$4.5 billion ceiling on total authorizations.

Reduce authorizations for each item for each nation by 10 percent.

Cut \$47,200,000 from authorization for economic and technical assistance for India and Pakistan.

Reduce by \$50 million the authorization for furnishing special nonatomic weapons to eligible nations.

Increase by \$1 million the authorization for payment of ocean freight charges on relief shipments.

Bar aid to countries that do not accept technical aid from the United States in the collection of their taxes.

Delete language stating that Congress favors the negotiation of a Pacific pact for common defense of the Far East, South Asia, and the Pacific Ocean area.

Pages 7096-7143

**Traffic Transportation:** Agreed to Senate amendments to H. R. 2347, to continue for 6 months after termination of the national emergency of certain powers of the President relating to priorities in the transportation of traffic, and thereby cleared the bill for Presidential action.

Page 7143

**Order of Business:** Calendar Wednesday business, in order on June 24, was dispensed with pursuant to a unanimous-consent request.

Page 7143

**Bills Referred:** 10 Senate-passed measures were today referred to appropriate committees.

Pages 7146-7147

**Program for Monday:** Adjourned at 7:54 p. m. until Monday, June 22, at 12 o'clock noon. For program see Congressional Program Ahead in this Digest.

## Committee Meetings

### RESERVE FORCES POLICY

**Committee on Armed Services:** Johnson Subcommittee No. 3 met again today with the Reserve Forces Policy Board in executive session.

### DEFENSE DEPARTMENT—REORGANIZATION

**Committee on Government Operations:** Departmental witnesses testified today as public hearings were resumed on H. J. Res. 264, which provides for the taking effect of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 6, relating to the Department of Defense. The resolution calls for putting the plan in effect 10 days after enactment of the measure, but subsections (c) and (d) of section 1 would not take effect, relating to membership and management of the Joint Staff. Appearing for testimony were Nelson Rockefeller, Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Donald M. Kyes, Deputy Secretary of Defense, who supplemented his testimony of last Wednesday, when he endorsed the President's plan; and Joseph M. Dodge, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Recessed until tomorrow morning when Fleet Adm. William D. Leahy is scheduled to testify.

### VIRGIN ISLANDS

**Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:** The Saylor Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Possessions continued public hearings on H. R. 5181, 5608, and 5835,







17. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 29 (p. 7761). Legislative program for this week, as announced by the majority leader: Mon., excess-profits tax; Tues., VA office in Philippines, post office bill, and Interparliamentary Union; remainder of week, Defense Department appropriation bill; conference reports at any time (pp. 7719-20).

SENATE - June 27

18. REORGANIZATION. Concurred in the House amendment to S. 106, to establish a Commission on Governmental Operations (pp. 7636-7). This bill will now be sent to the President.
19. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS. Agreed to the House amendment to S. 1514 with a further amendment (p. 7636). (See item 16 of this Digest for later action.)
20. WHEAT AGREEMENT. Received from this Department a proposed bill to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949; to Foreign Relations Committee (p. 7630).
21. FARM LOANS. Received from this Department a proposed bill to make permanent the farm-housing loan authorization of the Housing Act of 1949; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 7630).
22. TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 287, making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1954 (S. Rept. 474). Sen. Bridges requested immediate consideration, but Sen. Gore objected and asked that the measure go over until today. (p. 7686.) (See item 10 of this Digest for House action on the measure.)
23. ELECTRIFICATION; FERTILIZER. Sen. Morse criticized the administration's electric power policies and inserted a statement by USDA officials on fertilizer (pp. 7686-706).
24. FOREIGN AID. S. 2128, to extend the mutual security program, was made the unfinished business (p. 7675).
25. DROUGHT RELIEF. Sens. Thye, Schoeppel, and Johnson of Tex. spoke on the seriousness of the current drought and asked for Government aid in this connection (pp. 7639-40, 7682-4).
26. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Kefauver criticized the Government's electric-power policies, particularly as they affect TVA (pp. 7677-82).
27. LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. The Appropriations Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) with amendments H. R. 5246. The "Daily Digest" states: "As approved, the bill would provide a total of \$2,008,435,761, an increase of \$27,729,300 over the House-passed figure of \$1,980,706,461." (p. D626.)
28. ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 5376 (pp. 7641-75). Senate conferees were appointed (p. 7675).
29. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Hennings inserted his statement concerning Federal power policy, opposing the House Appropriations Committee's action on this matter and urging adequate funds for water resources and rural electrification (pp. 7637-9).
30. RECESSED until Mon., June 29 (p. 7706).



BILLS INTRODUCED - June 27

31. WATER-FACILITIES LOANS. H. R. 5975, by Rep. Gathings, to extend the Water Facilities Act to the entire U. S.; to Agriculture Committee (p. 7761). Remarks of author (p. 7760).
32. LIVESTOCK. H. R. 5970, by Rep. Albert, to provide for the purchase of canner, cutter, and utility grade cattle; to Agriculture Committee (p. 7761).
33. ALASKA LANDS. S. 2232, by Sen. Butler, Nebr., relating to reservation of public lands in Alaska; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 7633).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

34. WHEAT MARKETING. During debate on H. R. 5451, to amend the wheat marketing quota law, Rep. Hays favored reducing the acreage allotment from 66 to 62 million acres as recommended by this Department (p. A4063).
35. FARM POLICY. During debate on H. R. 5451, Rep. McCarthy criticized the administration's farm policies, claiming the farmers were promised 100% of parity but are getting about 93% (pp. A4063-4).
36. GRAZING LANDS. Rep. Metcalf inserted Bernard DeVoto's recent article criticizing the Chamber of Commerce for furnishing scripts for local radio programs favoring the stockmen's grazing bills (pp. A4069-71).
37. TARIFFS; INTEREST RATES. Rep. Deane inserted Rep. Lantaff's speech blaming the administration for "high interest rates and high tariffs" (pp. A4074-6).
38. TEXTILES. Rep. Lane inserted a National Wool Grower article discussing the battle between synthetic-fiber manufacturers and wool-cotton groups (pp. A4080-1).
39. T. V. A. Rep. Perkins inserted a newspaper editorial defending TVA and deploring administration decisions regarding it (pp. A4082-3).
40. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Rep. Multer inserted Doris Fleeson's article claiming Mr. Eccles feels that the immediate danger ahead is deflation (pp. A4073-9).  
Rep. Hiestand inserted Pres. Shoup's (Holly Sugar Corp.) recent speech favoring "return to sound currency" (pp. A4083-4).
41. GRAZING LANDS. Rep. D'Ewart inserted an Arizona Republic article favoring H. R. 4023, the stockmen's grazing bill (p. A4097).
42. EXPENDITURES; TAXATION. Rep. Steed inserted a Stillwater (Okla.) Chamber of Commerce plan for a balanced budget and tax relief (p. A4105).
43. FORESTRY RESEARCH. Rep. Davis inserted Harris Ellsworth's address urging continued institutional research in forest products (pp. A4108-10).

BILL APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

44. EXTENSION SERVICE. S. 1679, to consolidate Extension Service authorizations. Approved June 26, 1953 (Public Law 83, 83rd Cong.).

# Daily Digest

## HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed Army civil functions appropriations and cleared for President bill on executive branch commission.

House approved Defense Department reorganization plan, passed bills on housing, and cleared terminal leave payment bill for the President.

Senate Appropriations Committee voted to report Labor-HEW funds bill.

## Senate

### Chamber Action

*Routine Proceedings, pages 7630-7641*

**Bills Introduced:** 7 bills and 3 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2226 to S. 2232; S. J. Res. 92; S. Con. Res. 36; and S. Res. 123. *Pages 7633, 7685*

**Bills Reported:** Reports were made as follows:

H. R. 4779, to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damage on Illinois River, Ill. (S. Rept. 473);

H. J. Res. 287, making temporary appropriations for fiscal year 1954 (S. Rept. 474); and

S. Res. 123, authorizing additional expenditures of \$10,000 by Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during 83d Congress (no written report)—referred to Committee on Rules and Administration. *Page 7633*

**Bills Referred:** 2 House-passed bills and 1 House-passed resolution were referred to appropriate committees. *Pages 7635, 7675*

**Army Civil Functions Appropriations:** Senate passed, with amendments, H. R. 5376, Army civil functions appropriations for fiscal year 1954, after taking the following actions on amendments thereto:

**Adopted:** All committee amendments; and an amendment by Senator Knowland providing that \$3,684,000 rather than \$3,000,000 be available during fiscal year for general and administrative expenses of Panama Canal Co.; and

**Rejected:** Three amendments proposed to committee amendment on funds for general construction, as follows: Sparkman amendment to increase figure by \$1 million for work on Warrior River Dam; Martin amendment to increase figure by \$100,000 for Johnsonburg, Pa., flood-control project; and on division, Magnuson amendment to increase figure by \$3 million for Ice Harbor Dam, Wash.

Senate asked for a conference with the House on the bill and appointed as conferees Senators Knowland,

Young, Cordon, Thye, Martin, Hayden, Russell, and Ellender. *Pages 7641-7675*

**Governmental Functions:** Senate took the following action respecting S. 1514, to establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources:

Concurred in House amendment to this bill, with an amendment by Senator Taft, providing that not more than nine of the members of the Commission appointed by the President shall be members of the same political party. *Page 7636*

**Executive Branch:** Senate concurred in House amendment to, and cleared for President, S. 106, for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. *Pages 7636-7637*

**Mutual Security:** Senate made its unfinished business S. 2128, to extend the mutual security program for fiscal year 1954. *Page 7675*

**Treaties Received:** Senate received the following two treaties, both of which were referred to Committee on Foreign Relations:

Agreement between U. S. and Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Bonn on June 3, 1953, concerning application of Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Consular Rights between U. S. and Germany, signed at Washington on December 8, 1923, together with texts of related notes (Exec. N, 83d Cong., 1st sess.); and

Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation between U. S. and Japan, together with protocol relating thereto, signed at Tokyo on April 2, 1953 (Exec. O, 83d Cong., 1st sess.). *Pages 7676-7677*

**Confirmation:** Nomination of Lewis L. Strauss, of Virginia, to be member of AEC, was confirmed. *Page 7706*

**Nominations:** Three Navy nominations were received. *Page 7706*



Program for Monday: Senate recessed at 6:59 p. m. until noon Monday, June 29, when it will consider S. 2128, to extend the mutual security program for fiscal year 1954.

## Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

### APPROPRIATIONS—ARMED SERVICES

*Committee on Appropriations:* Armed Services subcommittee continued its executive hearings on proposed 1954 budget estimates for the Defense Department, with testimony today in behalf of funds for the National Security Training Commission from Adm. Thomas C.

Kinkaid and Gen. Raymond S. McLain, both Commissioners, and Edgar Shelton, Executive Director, all of the National Security Training Commission.

Hearings continue June 29.

### APPROPRIATIONS—LABOR-HEW

*Committee on Appropriations:* Committee, in executive session, completed marking up H. R. 5246, Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations for 1954, and ordered the bill favorably reported to the Senate with amendments. As approved, the bill would provide a total of \$2,008,435,761, an increase of \$27,729,300 over the House-passed figure of \$1,980,706,461.

# House of Representatives

## Chamber Action

**Bills Introduced:** 8 public bills, H. R. 5969-5976; 10 private bills, H. R. 5977-5986; and 5 resolutions, H. J. Res. 287, H. Con. Res. 125, and H. Res. 306-308, were introduced

Pages 7707, 7761-7762

**Bills Reported:** Reports were filed as follows:

H. Res. 306, closed rule providing for 4 hours of debate on, and waiving points of order against, H. R. 5899, to extend until December 31, 1953, the period with respect to which the excess-profits tax will be effective (H. Rept. 679);

H. R. 5969, Department of Defense appropriation bill for 1954 (H. Rept. 680);

H. J. Res. 287, making temporary appropriations for fiscal year 1954 (H. Rept. 681);

(Adverse) H. Res. 283, inquiring into the effect on the weather of certain atomic bomb explosions (H. Rept. 682);

S. J. Res. 88, to authorize a 1-year extension of certain charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines (H. Rept. 683); and

H. R. 5228, to amend the Budget and Accounting Act relative to annuities for retired Comptrollers General (H. Rept. 684).

Page 7761

**Defense Department Reorganization:** By a rollcall vote of 108 yeas to 235 nays, the House rejected H. Res. 295, to disapprove of Reorganization Plan No. 6 relating to the Department of Defense, and in effect approved the plan. The plan automatically goes into effect on midnight June 29.

Pages 7707-7719

**Veterans' Housing:** Passed, by a voice vote, H. R. 5456, to extend direct housing loans for veterans for 1 year. Subsequently, S. 1993, a similar bill, was taken from the Speaker's table, amended to contain the text of H. R. 5456, and passed, after which the House bill was tabled.

Pages 7719, 7733-7734

**Annual and Sick Leave:** Adopted, by a rollcall vote of 269 yeas to 65 nays, conference report on, and thereby cleared for the President, H. R. 4654, providing for exemption of certain executive officers from Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951. This bill removes from the Annual and Sick Leave Act Cabinet members and Presidential appointees (with the exception of postmasters and U. S. attorneys and marshals) but will not affect leave accrued by such personnel prior to enactment of this legislation. The so-called Thomas rider is repealed as of June 30, 1953, and the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 is amended to limit future total accruable leave and total lump-sum cash payment to 30 days.

Pages 7720-7729

**Atomic Explosions—Weather:** Tabled H. Res. 283, directing the Secretary of Commerce to furnish to the House of Representatives full and complete information about the effect on the weather of certain atomic bomb explosions. The information requested had been furnished the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and was today inserted in the Record.

Page 7729

**Intergovernmental Relations:** S. 1514, to establish a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, was cleared for Presidential action when the House concurred in a Senate amendment to a House amendment to the bill.

Page 7731

**Philippine Shipping:** Adopted, and cleared for the White House, S. J. Res. 88, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to extend to June 30, 1954, certain charters of vessels to Philippine citizens for use in interisland services.

Pages 7731-7732

**Housing:** Passed, by a voice vote, H. R. 5667, to amend the National Housing Act and other laws relating to housing. This passage was subsequently vacated after a similar Senate-passed bill (S. 2103) was amended to







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 30, 1953  
For actions of June 29, 1953  
83rd-1st, No. 119

## CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,13,20	Farm prices.....27	Nomination.....4
Buildings.....19	Farm program.....23	Personnel.....6
Cotton.....18,21	F.H.A.....4	Prices, support.....10
Crop insurance.....5	Foreign aid.....2	Research.....5
Dairy products.....25	Forestry.....5,9	Taxation.....14,16
Defense production.....17	Housing.....30	Tobacco.....25
Disaster relief.....7,19	Imports.....5	Transportation.....26
Drought relief.....8,15	Lands, public.....12	Treaties.....29
Electrification.....28	Legislative program.....11	Watershed program.....24
Emergency powers.....3	Loans, farm.....5,30	Wheat.....5,22
Expenditures.....6		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed temporary-appropriation measure. Ready for President. Senate committee voted to report bills to transfer land tracts, control sheep diseases, authorize Alaska forest survey, increase interest on farm-tenant loans, expand crop insurance, and extend fur loans. Senate committee reported McLeaish nomination to FHA. Sen. Johnson, Tex., introduced and discussed drought relief bill. Senate committee reported Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Senate debated foreign-aid bill.

## SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 287, to make funds available to Government agencies pending enactment of the regular appropriation bills for 1954 (p. 7779). This measure will now be sent to the President.  
The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 5246, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1954 (S. Rept. 478)(p. 7765).
2. FOREIGN AID. Began debate on S. 2128, to extend the Mutual Security Act (pp. 7775, 7781-93, D630).
3. EMERGENCY POWERS. Passed with amendment H. J. Res. 285, to continue through July certain emergency powers of the President (p. 7765).
4. NOMINATION. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported the nomination of Robert B. McLeaish to be Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration (p. 7776).
5. FORESTRY; RESEARCH; CROP INSURANCE; FARM LOANS; WHEAT IMPORTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) the following bills without amendment: S. 1400, to release the reversionary rights of the U. S. in a tract of Rural Rehabilitation Corporation land in Wake County, N. C.; S. 2055, to provide for control and eradication of scrapie and blue tongue in sheep; S. 2163, to authorize conveyance of certain lands in the U. S. cottonfield station near Statesville, N. C., to the State; and S. 725, to amend the act authorizing a national survey of forest resources so as to include U. S. Territories and possessions. The Committee ordered reported with amendment S. 1276, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act in order to increase the



interest rate on loans made under title I of such Act; S. 1367, to extend for 4 years the authority for expansion of the crop-insurance program into additional counties; S. 984, to provide for conveyance of certain national forest land in Basalt, Colo.; and S. 1152, to extend for 5 years the authority of the Department to make loans to fur farmers.

The "Daily Digest" states: "...the committee gave its approval to the introduction of an original resolution which would provide funds to continue the investigation of Canadian wheat imported as unfit for human consumption." (pp. D629-30.)

6. EXPENDITURES; PERSONNEL. The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures submitted a report on personnel statistics and unexpended balances of appropriations (pp. 7765-9).
7. DISASTER RELIEF. The Public Works Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) with amendment S. 2199, to allow State and local governments during major disasters to use or distribute certain surplus equipment and supplies of the Federal Government (p. D631).
8. DROUGHT RELIEF. Sen. Knowland inserted a news report describing the actions being taken by the administration to provide drought relief in Tex. and Okla. (p. 7793).
9. FORESTRY. Sen. Wiley inserted a Wisconsin Conservation Congress recommendation in favor of earmarking 10% of forest receipts for recreation and wildlife, and opposing the stockmen's grazing bill (p. 7765).
10. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Young inserted a Rolla Commercial Club resolution supporting the price-support program (p. 7793).
11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Knowland expressed a hope that the mutual-security trade-agreements bills can be passed by Thurs. and indicated that the calendar will be called Mon., following which appropriation bills will be considered (pp. 7780-1, 7793-4).

#### HOUSE

12. PUBLIC LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 334, to regulate the disposition of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite and cinders located on public lands (H. Rept. 686)(p. 7817).
13. APPROPRIATIONS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution waiving points of order on H. R. 5969, the Defense Department appropriation bill for 1954 (p. 7817).
14. TAXATION. Deferred indefinitely the consideration of a resolution for debate on H. R. 5899, to extend the excess-profit tax for 6 months, in order to give the Ways and Means Committee opportunity for further consideration of the bill (pp. 7802-8).

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

15. DROUGHT RELIEF. S. 2233, to provide assistance to farmers and stockmen in areas where a production disaster caused by severe drought has occurred; by Sen. Johnson, Tex., for himself and others; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee; remarks of author (pp. 7770-1).

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION,  
AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGEN-  
CIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

JUNE 29 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1953.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. THYE, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the  
following

## REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 5246]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill passed by House.....	\$1, 980, 706, 461
Amount added by Senate (net).....	27, 729, 300
Total of bill as reported to Senate.....	2, 008, 435, 761
Amount of 1954 budget estimates:	
Original budget estimates.....	2, 098, 062, 861
Revised budget estimates.....	2, 021, 513, 470
Amount of 1953 appropriations.....	2, 254, 781, 300
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under the original budget estimates, 1954.....	89, 627, 100
Under the revised budget estimates, 1954.....	13, 077, 709
Under appropriations for fiscal year 1953.....	246, 345, 539



## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

1953 appropriation.....	\$1, 764, 600
Original estimate.....	1, 764, 600
Revised estimate.....	1, 714, 600
House allowance.....	1, 350, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 350, 000

The committee recommends a substitute provision fixing the salary of the Solicitor, as follows:

*That hereafter the compensation of the Solicitor shall be at the rate equal to the rate established by law for grade GS-18.*

In the 1953 bill the Senate adopted an amendment which in the sense of the committee permanently fixed the Solicitor's salary. But the Department included this proviso in its 1954 estimate, stating that the GAO construed the provision as temporary. This committee asked for an opinion from the Senate Legislative Counsel, who advised that in view of the background, including the Senate report of last year, he considered the provision as permanently fixing the salary of the Solicitor.

The proviso was in the bill as it came from the House, so this committee has reworded the proviso to permanently fix the salary.

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

1953 appropriation.....	\$838, 000
Original estimate.....	998, 000
Revised estimate.....	928, 000
House allowance.....	624, 000
Committee recommendation.....	700, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$76,000 over the House allowance, but an amount \$228,000 under the revised estimate.

The committee directs the Bureau to allocate to its safety program not less than the amount budgeted in the revised estimate, \$425,572. The committee had been advised that under the House allowance this program would be reduced by \$200,000, a reduction of 46.92 percent. It is the consensus of the committee that this safety program is the major justification for this Bureau.

The committee concurs with the House recommendation that no funds are allowed for increased activity in the field of migratory labor.

The committee also recommends the inclusion of the following language after the word "exhibits":

*and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards.*

This language has appeared in the bill for many years.

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

1953 appropriation.....	\$3, 369, 000
Original estimate.....	3, 400, 000
Revised estimate.....	3, 324, 000
House allowance.....	3, 400, 000
Committee recommendation.....	3, 230, 000

The committee recommends a reduction of \$170,000 under the House allowance, and \$94,000 below the revised estimate.

A review of the workload summary reveals that in comparison with fiscal year 1948, the workload for fiscal year 1952 had decreased 8.08 percent in programs; 3.79 percent in establishments participating; and 23.30 percent in apprentices; while the appropriations had increased 48.77 percent and employees had increased 25.51 percent. And in consequence the committee feels that this slight reduction of 5 percent under the House allowance, and 2.82 percent under the revised estimate, is justified.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

1953 appropriation-----	\$5, 679, 000
Original estimate-----	5, 867, 000
Revised estimate-----	5, 435, 000
House allowance-----	5, 100, 000
Committee recommendation-----	5, 225, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$125,000 over the House allowance, but an amount \$210,000 under the revised estimate.

The Bureau will be enabled with the restoration here recommended to allocate the full amount of its budget request for the collection and interpretation of labor market information and for the farm placement service, and the balance of the increase to assistance in maintaining public employment services.

#### BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

##### GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

1953 appropriation-----	\$197, 110, 000
Original estimate-----	218, 000, 000
Revised estimate-----	213, 600, 000
House allowance-----	187, 300, 000
Committee recommendation-----	197, 110, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$9,810,000 over the House allowance, but a reduction of \$16,490,000 under the revised estimate. The committee also recommends the inclusion of the words "or salary costs" at the proper place in the appropriation language to permit the use of the contingent fund to meet increased costs of administration resulting from increased salary costs.

In support of requests for an increased allowance presented by sundry proponents the argument was advanced that this appropriation was derived, not from general fund of the Treasury, but from a special fund—a trust fund—a designated fund—a set-aside fund. Section 1600 of the Internal Revenue Code imposes a tax on each covered employer equal to 3 percent of the total wages paid by him during a calendar year. Section 1601 provides that the taxpayer may credit against such tax the amount of contributions paid by him, and additional credit with respect to merit ratings, under a State unemployment compensation law, with a limit of total credit not to exceed 90 percent of the 3-percent tax. A minimum of 0.3 percent is payable to the Federal Government by each covered employer. The tax pay-



ments are paid into the Treasury as internal revenue collections, not earmarked for any specific purpose. There have been several bills in Congress, one of the most recent being H. R. 4133, 82d Congress, to earmark the collections under section 1600, but none has received favorable action by the Congress.

There was no evidence adduced to indicate a decline in employment to result in an increased claims load and an increased placement load. Much of the argument for the increased estimate over the 1953 level was based on increased salary costs in the States. Attention is invited to the fact that oftentimes following an increase in compensation for Federal employees, the executive agencies are required to absorb the major part of such increase, while heretofore the increased salary costs in this program have been borne by this appropriation without the absorption of any portion by the administrative groups.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS, BUREAU OF  
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

1953 appropriation.....	\$27, 200, 000
Original estimate.....	47, 000, 000
Revised estimate.....	41, 000, 000
House allowance.....	41, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	38, 500, 000

The committee recommends a reduction of \$2,500,000 under the House allowance and the revised estimate, but an amount \$11,300,000 over the 1953 appropriation.

As of June 13, the payments to veterans under this program for the current fiscal year amounted to \$22,847,409, and the Department estimates that the payments through June will bring total payments to \$24,677,501, leaving a balance of \$2,522,499 of the 1953 appropriation, available until expended.

It was originally estimated that all of the 1953 appropriation would be expended in the current fiscal year and that the \$41 million requested would fully meet the Government's liability in 1954. The committee's recommendation will still make available \$41 million during fiscal year 1954.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM, BUREAU OF  
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

1953 appropriation.....	\$2, 705, 000
Original estimate.....	1, 740, 000
Revised estimate.....	1, 600, 000
House allowance.....	1, 250, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 250, 000

The committee concurs with the House action, allowing \$1,250,000 a reduction of \$350,000 under the revised estimate, for the operation of the program through December 1953.

The House report stated that \$100,000 was specifically approved for liquidation costs if the agreement with the Republic of Mexico were not extended. This committee concurs with this earmarking of the fund, allowing \$1,150,000 for operation, and \$100,000 to be available only for liquidation costs if the agreement is not extended.

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

1953 appropriation.....	\$5, 779, 000
Original estimate.....	5, 939, 000
Revised estimate.....	5, 627, 000
House allowance.....	5, 250, 000
Committee recommendation.....	5, 345, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$95,000 over the House allowance, but an amount \$282,000 under the revised estimate.

Of the House reduction of \$377,000 the Bureau allotted \$205,886 to the housing and public construction statistics program, a reduction of 62 percent, while the amount budgeted for this activity amounted to only 5.85 percent of the total estimate.

The committee directs the Bureau to proceed with the revision of of the housing construction statistics in the light of the 1950 census, for which \$95,000 was requested. If the accumulation and issuance of valid statistics in this field will require the restoration to this activity of more than the increase recommended, the committee will expect the funds to be allocated for the purpose, by adjusting the allocations to other activities—administration, from which no reduction was assessed in allocating the House reduction, and foreign labor conditions and central administrative services, from which token reductions were made in allocating the House cut.

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES, WOMEN'S BUREAU

1953 appropriation.....	\$360, 000
Original estimate.....	360, 000
Revised estimate.....	350, 000
House allowance.....	360, 000
Committee recommendation.....	350, 000

The committee recommends a reduction of \$10,000 under the House allowance, but the sum requested in the revised budget estimate.

It is hoped that the Bureau will be able to adequately perform its promotional work with the States and labor and management groups within the sum recommended, the revised estimate.

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES, WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

1953 appropriation.....	\$7, 639, 139
Original estimate.....	7, 639, 000
Revised estimate.....	7, 339, 000
House allowance.....	6, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	6, 250, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$250,000 over the House allowance, but an amount \$1,089,000 below the revised estimate.

The increase recommended will permit the Division to retain the most essential of the positions in the activity, promotion of compliance and enforcement, but the committee directs that none of the 50 positions in the administrative category be reinstated.

In view of the fact that during the current fiscal year about half of the Division's investigations are in new establishments and in test checking, the committee feels that an adequate enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Public Contracts Act can be made with the funds here recommended.

It is the committee's desire that reductions be made in such manner that will not result in the elimination of any of the 10 present regional offices.



## GENERAL PROVISIONS

## TRANSFER AUTHORITY

*SEC. 103. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation in this title may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfer: Provided, That no such transfer shall be used for creation of new functions within the Department.*

The committee recommends the inclusion of the above-cited section in the bill. This language and authority has been contained in appropriation acts for the Department for the past 5 years and there is no evidence of its misuse. The committee will expect the Department to report to it the details with respect to each use of the transfer authority.

## TERMINAL LEAVE

*SEC. 104. Terminal leave: On request of the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer such amounts as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$300,000, from unobligated balances of appropriations for the Department of Labor, fiscal year 1953, to an appropriation account to be established for the payment of annual leave of employees separated from the service as a result of reductions of appropriations provided herein in excess of the average turnover of employees in said Department over the period 1947-52, to remain available until December 31, 1953.*

The committee recommends the inclusion of the above-cited section in the bill. This section is similar to provision heretofore approved by the Senate for other departments.

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

## CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS, COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

1953 Appropriation.....	\$90, 000
Original estimate.....	None
Revised estimate.....	41, 000
House allowance.....	None
Committee recommendation.....	41, 000

This construction program was necessary in order to accommodate approximately 25 Negro deaf children who have heretofore been attending school in Maryland. A request was presented to the Senate in 1952 for an appropriation of \$90,000, based on preliminary plans, which estimate was allowed in its entirety. Subsequently District building officials insisted that residential and classroom buildings for the District of Columbia pupils meet certain rigid requirements not provided in the original plans, resulting in a total cost of \$131,088 for construction. This recommendation will provide the balance necessary for construction costs. The Institution will require an additional \$5,000 for equipment but will attempt to defray this cost by economies elsewhere.

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

1953 appropriation.....	\$5, 600, 000
Original estimate.....	5, 663, 000
Revised estimate.....	5, 648, 000
House allowance.....	5, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	5, 200, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$200,000 over the House allowance, but an amount \$448,000 under the revised estimate.

No funds are allowed for statistical positions to improve sampling techniques or for additional personnel for investigations into the illegal sale of dangerous drugs without prescription.

The request presented to the committee for the former was rather amazing in that the justification offered was that a statistician would advise the inspection force, with years of experience, the amount of sample to extract from a quantity of butter, or wheat, or any commodity, to effect a valid test. While there are a few personnel now assigned to investigations into the illegal sale of dangerous drugs, it is the sense of the committee that such investigations are properly the province of local, State, and Federal law-enforcement officials.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

1953 appropriation.....	\$2, 860, 750
Original estimate.....	3, 196, 000
Revised estimate.....	3, 104, 000
House allowance.....	3, 104, 000

The committee concurs with the House action on this item, allowing the revised budget estimate.

Included in the estimate is a request for \$350,000 for conversion of the present electrical system from direct to alternating current. The request is approved but the committee directs the hospital to arrange with the local public utility for the furnishing of the additional power supply.

The committee has directed its staff to conduct an examination into the estimates of appropriations, and the problem of effecting some payment from bordering counties for treatment of indigent patients on a comparable basis with the District of Columbia which reimburses the hospital for each of its indigent patients.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, HOWARD UNIVERSITY

1953 appropriation.....	\$2, 675, 000
Original estimate.....	2, 750, 000
Revised estimate.....	2, 535, 000
House allowance.....	2, 535, 000

The committee concurs with the House action, allowing the revised budget estimate.

Included in the revised budget estimate is a request for \$40,000 to enable Howard University to install wiring and transformer vaults to furnish alternating current to Freedmen's Hospital. The committee has directed the hospital to procure its additional power supply from the local utility, relieving Howard University of the expense of installing wiring and transformer vaults for the purpose. The \$40,000 shall be used instead for resident instruction.

The committee hopes to have from its staff for its guidance and consideration next year a report on conditions at the university with respect to its enrollment, its schedule of fees, and its construction program.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS, HOWARD UNIVERSITY

1953 appropriation.....	\$280, 221
Original estimate.....	170, 000
Revised estimate.....	170, 000
House allowance.....	20, 000
Committee recommendation.....	170, 000



The committee recommends an increase of \$150,000 over the House allowance, and the amount of the estimate.

The House allowed funds only for the purchase and installation of a vacuum pump in the steam system, disallowing funds for an additional generator.

There is an unquestioned need for an additional power supply at Howard University. It has been suggested "that any requirements for electrical power that cannot be filled by the present plant should be secured commercially." The securing of additional power from the local utility company would require the installation of additional wiring and equipment, to cost, the committee is advised, in excess of the amount here requested for the additional generator. The committee hopes that by next year it can have a technical report prepared jointly by the Public Buildings Service and the local utility company on the conflicting views presented with respect to the cost of power generated at Howard University compared with the cost of power procured commercially.

#### PROMOTION AND FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OFFICE OF EDUCATION

1953 appropriation	<sup>1</sup> \$18, 673, 261
Original estimate	18, 673, 261
Revised estimate	14, 048, 870
House allowance	18, 673, 261

<sup>1</sup> Of which \$32,000 transferred to salaries and expenses, Office of Education, in Third Supplemental Act, 1953.

The committee concurs with the House action, allowing the original estimate, an increase of \$4,624,391 over the revised estimate.

The committee recommends the inclusion of the following proviso:

*Provided further, That not more than \$450,000 of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations.*

This proviso was contained in the original estimate, and only \$450,000 of the 1953 appropriation was available for this category as directed in the conference report of last year.

Without this limitation the Office of Education proposes to allocate \$1,678,032 to training in distributive occupations, an increase of \$1,228,032 over the 1953 allocation, and a like decrease in the other three categories, agriculture, home economies, and trades and industry.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF EDUCATION

1953 appropriation	\$2, 992, 000
Original estimate	3, 250, 000
Revised estimate	2, 926, 000
House allowance	2, 500, 000

The committee concurs with the House action, allowing \$2,500,000, a reduction of \$426,000 below the revised estimate.

The committee recommends the inclusion of the following clause, which has appeared in the appropriation acts for a number of years:

*of which not less than \$480,000 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education, as authorized.*

The presentation of the budget justifications to the committee this year by the Office of Education was rather inept and it is hoped that the administration of the Office will be strengthened during the

coming year. It is felt that with a restudy of the functions and a judicious use of available personnel, the programs can be adequately carried forward with the amount here recommended.

#### PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

1953 appropriation-----	\$60, 500, 000
Original estimate-----	70, 000, 000
Revised estimate-----	66, 500, 000
House allowance-----	66, 500, 000

The committee concurs with the House action in allowing \$66,500,000, the revised budget estimate.

The committee has authorized an amendment to be offered from the floor to enable the Boulder City Union School District to continue to receive Federal grants in the same amount as in the past under Public Law 874, 81st Congress, 2d session. This school district, lying wholly within a Federal reservation, is threatened with the loss of a substantial portion of its Federal support because of a county school tax imposed on the possessory interest in certain leaseholds within Boulder City, Nev. The acreage covered by these leaseholds generates approximately half of the school population, but which cannot be counted for the purpose of determining the Federal payment due to an interpretation which has been placed on a definition of Federal property contained in Public Law 874. The proposed amendment provides that all lands lying within the Boulder Canyon Project Reservation shall be construed as Federal property for the purposes of Public Law 874. The amendment further provides that the amount collected through imposition of the leasehold tax shall be deducted from the Federal payment and that the provision shall not be interpreted as in any way interfering with the right of a State, or a political subdivision thereof, to impose a leasehold tax. The committee specifically points out that nothing contained in this amendment shall be construed as in any way changing the presently defined boundaries of the Boulder Canyon Project Reservation.

#### SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION, OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Public Law 815, approved September 23, 1950, authorizes no additional entitlements after the fiscal year 1952, and no appropriations after the fiscal year 1953.

The 1953 appropriation authorized not to exceed \$750,000, of the \$195,000,000 provided, for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies. An agreement was entered into between the Office of Education and the Housing and Home Finance Agency for the latter to perform requisite engineering, inspection, and other technical services under the school-construction program, services which must be performed and for which the Office of Education is not equipped.

The committee considered a revised estimate, on which no action was taken by the House, to increase the administrative limitation by \$900,000, from \$750,000 to \$1,650,000. It has approved an increase of \$500,000 in the limitation, from \$750,000 to \$1,250,000, and cautions the Housing and Home Finance Agency to channel a greater percentage of the funds to the operating program and less to its administration.



Approximately 1,350 school-construction projects will be under way at the close of this fiscal year, of which about 250 will be completed on that date, leaving 1,100 for engineering and inspection service during the coming year.

#### PAYMENTS TO STATES, OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

1953 appropriation.....	\$22, 250, 000
Original estimate.....	23, 000, 000
Revised estimate.....	23, 000, 000
House allowance.....	23, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	21, 850, 000

The committee recommends a reduction of \$1,150,000 under the House allowance and the budget estimate.

This recommended reduction results from the reluctance of the States to participate more with their own resources in this program, which is directed to the rehabilitation of our citizens and their reentry into gainful employment, thus removing them from, or obviating their entry on, the public assistance rolls. The committee was advised that in 1952 a total of \$32,689,553 was spent by the States for vocational rehabilitation, of which amount \$22,122,537, or 67.67 percent, was contributed by the Federal Government, and only \$10,567,016 by the States.

The committee also recommends inclusion of the following language:

*Provided further, That after payment of amounts certified to be due for prior fiscal years, the funds herein appropriated shall be apportioned among the States in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary to insure equitable maintenance and improvement of State programs; and the obligations of the United States to any State under such Act for fiscal year 1954 shall not exceed the amount so apportioned to such State.*

The Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses have during the past several years reiterated their views that the authorizing legislation did not assure the approval of indefinite amounts of Federal funds for this program, and that the States should assume a larger percentage of its cost. The language here recommended will give legislative notice to the States that an open-end appropriation is not countenanced.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

1953 appropriation.....	\$700, 000
Original estimate.....	725, 000
Revised estimate.....	690, 000
House allowance.....	690, 000
Committee recommendation.....	655, 500

The committee recommends a reduction of \$34,500 under the House allowance and the revised estimate.

It is felt that this recommendation will permit the Office to adequately advise the States with respect to their plans and services.

#### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

##### ASSISTANCE TO STATES, GENERAL

1953 appropriation.....	\$16, 200, 000
Original estimate.....	16, 315, 000
Revised estimate.....	16, 215, 000
House allowance.....	13, 250, 000
Committee recommendation.....	13, 250, 000

The committee concurs with the House action allowing \$13,250,000, a reduction of \$2,965,000 under the revised estimate, and \$2,950,000 under the 1953 appropriation.

The committee recommends the inclusion of the following proviso: *of which not more than \$2,400,000 shall be available for personal services.*

In 1953, with an appropriation of \$16,200,000, there are 544 positions financed from this account. Under the revised estimate for \$16,215,000, provision was made for 563 employees. The committee is advised that under the House allowance, a reduction of \$2,965,000 under the revised estimate, there will be no reduction in the number of employees, with a personal service cost of \$2,605,775, equal to the amount budgeted for personal services in the revised estimate, and \$4,500 more than was available for personal services in 1953. The committee feels constrained to force a reduction of the number of employees.

#### CONTROL OF COMMUNICABLE DISEASES

1953 appropriation.....	\$5, 919, 750
Original estimate.....	5, 735, 000
Revised estimate.....	5, 335, 000
House allowance.....	5, 000, 000

The committee concurs with the House action, allowing \$5 million, a reduction of \$335,000 under the revised estimate.

The committee was advised by the Public Health Service that the House cut "will require the complete cessation of the important field investigation activities on poliomyelitis, including epidemiologic field studies on its transmission, and studies on fly control in relation to poliomyelitis morbidity." The committee was amazed at this determination and accordingly is recommending the following proviso: *of which not less than \$400,000 shall be used for studies, prevention, and control activities on poliomyelitis.*

The committee directs that the activities "General disease prevention and control activities" and "Administration" be reduced by the amount needed to finance the work on poliomyelitis.

#### ENGINEERING, SANITATION, AND INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE

1953 appropriation.....	\$3, 700, 000
Original estimate.....	3, 985, 000
Revised estimate.....	3, 850, 000
House allowance.....	3, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	3, 325, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$325,000 over the House allowance, but a decrease of \$525,000 under the revised estimate.

The committee was advised by the Public Health Service that the House cut would seriously reduce, among other things, the interstate certification of milk shipments, but that no reduction would be made in its activity "administration." The committee directs that the full budget request be allotted to the interstate certification of milk shipments, and that not more than \$100,000 be used for administration, a reduction of \$19,800 from the budget estimate.



## GRANTS FOR HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

1953 appropriation.....	\$75, 000, 000
Original estimate.....	75, 000, 000
Revised estimate.....	60, 000, 000
House allowance.....	50, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	60, 000, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$10,000,000 over the House allowance, but an amount \$15,000,000 under the 1953 appropriation. This recommendation amounts to only 40 percent of the amount authorized, \$150,000,000.

Many of the States—32—have resorted to the split-project method of financing hospital construction, by which there is allotted to each project each year only that amount which will be actually expended during the year. In this way more projects can be gotten underway. This is predicated, of course, upon the expectation, and hope, that the appropriations for the ensuing years will be sufficient to permit the State to allot the projected portion annually. But it does not, of course, result in a contract obligation of the Federal Government.

If the amount approved by the House, \$50,000,000, is sustained, 14 States—Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, and Virginia—will receive an allotment insufficient to finance as planned the split projects. Under the revised estimate recommended by the committee, seven of these States—Arkansas, Kentucky, New Jersey, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Utah—will receive an allotment insufficient to finance the split projects.

The practice which has been followed of parceling out Federal funds by the State agencies to a number of applicants, sponsors of hospital construction, none of whose projects could be completed as planned unless further Federal appropriations are made, is in the sense of the committee highly undesirable. It tends to rob the Congress of its responsibility to determine the scope of the program in future years by creating what the localities regard as moral obligations to complete projects which have been started.

The committee feels that the Public Health Service should restudy the split-project method of financing. It feels very strongly that should such method be continued, there must be a clear understanding that this does not constitute a moral commitment for the Congress to provide additional funds and that the local sponsors may start building only with the understanding that they may have to provide the full amount necessary to complete the projects.

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES, HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION SERVICES

1953 appropriation.....	\$1, 200, 000
Original estimate.....	1, 200, 000
Revised estimate.....	1, 125, 000
House allowance.....	750, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 000, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$250,000 over the House allowance, but a sum \$125,000 under the revised estimate.

While the committee was advised that no less than the revised estimate was required to adequately perform the duties devolving from the Hill-Burton Act, it is felt that the sum recommended will be

sufficient to permit the performance of the essential parts of the program, and the committee suggests that the \$125,000 cut be applied in the administrative field and in the planning field for future programs.

## HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL CARE

1953 appropriation-----	\$33, 688, 000
Original estimate-----	35, 224, 000
Revised estimate-----	33, 551, 000
House allowance-----	32, 500, 000

The committee concurs with the House action, allowing \$32,500,000, a reduction of \$1,051,000 from the revised estimate.

The committee approves the House allowance in view of the fact that the Surgeon General advises that with this sum all beneficiaries entitled to medical care will be afforded same in those hospitals remaining open, or by contract with private clinics, hospitals, and doctors.

The committee has been advised that the tubercular hospital at Fort Stanton, N. Mex., has been closed and that the hospital and certain contiguous ground has been turned over to the State of New Mexico. The committee directs that the remaining land, some 26,000 acres, be retained and that it not be declared surplus, pending an examination and study by this committee.

The committee believes that the Surgeon General should not close any hospital operated with this appropriation without first making every effort, in cooperation with other appropriate agencies of the Federal Government, or State or local units of government, to secure maximum use of the facilities of such hospitals insofar as possible.

## NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

In considering all the items constituting the budget of the National Institutes of Health, the committee acted on the basis of two general assumptions. First, the country can expect returns in the form of decreased suffering of its people and in decreased costs of medical care from an expanded medical research program. Second, testimony before the committee has indicated clearly that the support for medical research provided by the Federal Government is not balanced. In general, there are fields—such as diabetes in the metabolic disease area, multiple sclerosis and muscular dystrophy in the neurological disease areas—that are relatively weakly supported. The committee hopes that increases in such areas may be more substantial during the next few years.

The revised budget estimates for the 8 appropriation accounts in the National Institutes of Health totaled \$56,340,000. The House allowed \$61,586,200, a net increase of \$5,246,200 over the revised estimates. The committee recommends a total of \$72,153,000, an increase of \$10,566,800, all of which is specifically allowed for grants for research and training, over the House allowance, and \$15,813,000 over the revised estimates, an increase of 28 percent. The committee was asked to provide more funds for research, for training, and for construction of research facilities, but feels it has been liberal in its recommendations in view of the determination to reduce Federal expenditures.



The committee has instructed its staff to make a thorough investigation with respect to research projects financed through these appropriations in order that the committee may know whether or not there is waste and duplication, and what the accomplishments have been; and further that the committee may have valid figures with respect to the total funds made available, from all sources, to this type of research.

The staff was directed to determine the availability of competent research personnel without depriving other research of the skills needed for its particular work.

#### OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

1953 appropriation-----	\$5, 010, 350
Original estimate-----	5, 180, 000
Revised estimate-----	4, 675, 000
House allowance-----	4, 675, 000

The committee concurs with the House action, allowing the revised budget estimate.

The appropriation language proposes that patient-feeding facilities, with separate dining space and snack bar, in the Clinicial Center be used in feeding employees and visitors to the National Institutes of Health. The language has been modified, to insure that the cost of feeding employees and others be fully recovered by adequate charges for the meals served, as follows:

*Provided further, That the Surgeon General is authorized to operate facilities at the National Institutes of Health for the sale of meals to employees and others and the proceeds thereof may be credited to this appropriation at rates determined by him to be sufficient to recover the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be credited to this appropriation.*

A number of witnesses before the committee cited cases in which research originally directed at one disease or medical problem ultimately produced results applicable to other diseases. Cortisone, for example, was originally studied in this country as a means of helping airmen bear the stress of high-altitude flight. Years later its usefulness in treating arthritis was discovered.

Those medical scientists whose current interests are related to a single group of diseases have stressed to the committee the urgency of supporting general studies that should not at the moment be linked to any specific disease, even though they may provide the keys that are missed by those whose studies are more directly tied to a specific disease.

This appropriation is to cover such studies, and the committee strongly recommends that with the expansion of direct disease-related research adequate opportunity be provided for the more general research which experience has proved to be indispensable to the advance of medical science.

#### NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

1953 appropriation-----	\$17, 887, 000
Original estimate-----	22, 000, 000
Revised estimate-----	15, 780, 000
House allowance-----	17, 887, 000
Committee recommendation-----	20, 487, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$2,600,000 over the House allowance, and a sum \$4,707,000 over the revised estimate.

This appropriation covers the oldest of the categorical Institutes at Bethesda and provides support for a most difficult field. The committee is impressed by the steady progress being made in the early detection treatment and consequently the progressive increase in the rate of care of malignant disease. Progress as the result of grants to universities and hospitals, and as the result of the researches at Bethesda has been commendable. However, the committee is convinced that the full research potential available for work in this area is not being exploited as fully as is warranted.

Work at a fundamental level inquiring into the problems of growth, the factors which control growth, and these which modify normal growth toward the malignant state must be continued. Work at a clinical level could perhaps be expanded, particularly in the field of chemotherapy. The committee was impressed by the testimony covering the treatment of the leukemias with chemical agents and encourages an intensification of this effort. It appears that the serial examination of chemical agents in the clinic has certain developmental aspects which could suitably be engineered, for sake of economy of effort and time, in a manner which has facilitated the exploration of other therapeutic agents in the fields of infections and parasitic diseases.

Progress in the development of new treatment agents during recent years as reported to the committee by a number of witnesses carries with it the thought that certain aspects of this problem may have reached a stage where a large-scale integrated effort of a developmental nature may be warranted. The committee has in mind the precedents set by other large-scale controlled studies. One set of investigations rapidly produced definitive knowledge on the utility of penicillin and other powerful antibiotics. Another extensive biochemical, pharmacological, and clinical testing program has produced a medical cure for malaria. The committee is aware that these efforts necessarily involved the integration of a number of disciplines. A similar approach in the field of cancer therapy would of necessity include a fairly heavy investment in organic chemistry, biochemistry, and pharmacology in support of the trials in the human.

The committee does not wish to pass judgment on whether such an effort is warranted in the field of cancer at this time, but it is advised that men in the research field are most hopeful of accomplishments in this approach. Funds are provided for this research under the auspices of the National Cancer Institute. The committee will look forward to a detailed account of research underway in these areas during its hearings next spring.

#### MENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

1953 appropriation	\$10,895,000
Original estimate	15,500,000
Revised estimate	9,817,000
House allowance	10,895,000
Committee recommendation	12,345,000

The committee recommends an increase of \$1,450,000 over the House allowance, and an increase of \$2,528,000 over the revised estimate.

The committee is particularly impressed by these facts: It costs taxpayers more than one-half billion dollars every year to support



mental hospitals; the cost is rising rapidly; most of the money comes from State budgets. The authorities presenting testimony to the committee were unanimous in their conviction that only through expanded research in mental health is there any possibility of cutting these costs, or of even halting the upward trend. Competent opinion holds out no promise for a quick solution of the mental health problem. but as to the essentiality of more extensive research there is no difference of opinion.

The committee concurs with these views, and recommends that the budget for research grants proposed by the House be increased by \$1,450,000.

#### NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE

1953 appropriation.....	\$12,000,000
Original estimate.....	16,500,000
Revised estimate.....	11,040,000
House allowance.....	12,000,000
Committee recommendation.....	15,418,000

The committee recommends an increase of \$3,418,000 over the House allowance, and a sum \$4,378,000 in excess of the revised estimate.

The Heart Institute appears to have developed an effective program of support for investigators throughout the country in several important areas. Witnesses before the committee reported interesting progress in heart, vein, and artery surgery, in the development of new drugs for treatment and in the better understanding of the major causes of disease of the blood vessels, rheumatic fever, high blood pressure and hardening of the arteries. While progress continues toward an ultimate solution of these diseases, the solutions themselves are obviously quite a way in the future. But of all the major killers, the prospects for really significant advances in the foreseeable future seem brightest in the heart-disease area if research is accelerated.

In 1952 there were 1,493,570 deaths in the United States, of which 771,020, or 51.6 percent, resulted from cardiovascular diseases.

#### DENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

1953 appropriation.....	\$1,650,000
Original estimate.....	2,700,000
Revised estimate.....	1,740,000
House allowance.....	1,650,000
Committee recommendation.....	1,740,000

The committee recommends the revised estimate, an increase of \$90,000 over the House allowance.

Most of the dental research done to date in this country has been on teeth themselves. This research has been most beneficial, and most spectacularly in the finding that minute amounts of fluorides in water will sharply reduce the number of cavities in children's teeth. However, testimony before the committee stressed that the major developments to be anticipated in dental research will come through a broader approach—study of teeth as part of the total organism, and application of a wide range of scientific disciplines to study of not only teeth but all tissues in the mouth. This general extension of the scope of dental research is certain to be productive, but it must be stimulated by the provision of more adequate funds for dental research.

## ARTHRITIS AND METABOLIC DISEASE ACTIVITIES

1953 appropriation-----	\$4, 568, 900
Original estimate-----	8, 450, 000
Revised estimate-----	4, 976, 000
House allowance-----	5, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	7, 000, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$2,000,000 over the House allowance, and an increase of \$2,024,000 over the revised estimate.

The committee is impressed by the broad area of research and training that is the responsibility of this relatively new interest. Covering as it does the various types of arthritis, diseases of the endocrine system including diabetes and thyroid disease among the more important degenerative diseases, successful research in these areas will do much to limit disability and death in that large segment of our population beyond the years of young adulthood. It is apparent from the testimony that significant opportunities exist for the development of a more fundamental knowledge of the disorders of vital processes which are the basis of these complicated diseases. It is also apparent that sizable opportunity exists to apply basic available knowledge with great profit to the disease conditions in the human. Apart from new knowledge from research, it is also pertinent to the solution of the problems assigned to this Institute that they be in a position to provide training opportunities to a limited number of physicians so that the level of professional competence can be increased in this field.

## MICROBIOLOGY ACTIVITIES

1953 appropriation-----	\$5, 479, 200
Original estimate-----	7, 000, 000
Revised estimate-----	5, 738, 000
House allowance-----	5, 479, 200
Committee recommendation-----	5, 738, 000

The committee recommends the revised estimate, an increase of \$258,800 over the House allowance.

From the testimony presented the committee it is clear that a wide array of important virus diseases still present economic and medical problems of major importance. The probability that a vaccine for polio will be available within a few years as a result of a most intensive research campaign raises the hope that other virus diseases—such as the common cold and influenza—may fall before a comparable research onslaught.

## NEUROLOGY AND BLINDNESS ACTIVITIES

1953 appropriation-----	\$1, 972, 300
Original estimate-----	7, 670, 000
Revised estimate-----	2, 574, 000
House allowance-----	4, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	4, 750, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$750,000 over the House allowance, and an increase of \$2,176,000 over the revised estimate.

The afflictions studied by scientists in this Institute and by others supported by the Institute have been among the most baffling known to medical science. Disorders of the nervous system arise from obscure disarrangements of the mechanisms controlling the origin, trans-



mission and interrelationship of nerve impulses. The study of these mechanisms and the source of various kinds of faulty functioning is one of the most involved branches of medical research. Progress is being made. Drugs that will control epileptic seizures have been developed, and certain kinds of epilepsy are amenable to surgery. Knowledge of the nature and treatment of other neurological disorders such as multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, and cerebral palsy is not as advanced. The committee is impressed, however, with the fact that advances in biochemistry, in biophysics, and in extremely refined instrumentation are opening research leads that should be exploited.

The quick sympathy aroused by blindness, and particularly by blind children, has led to extensive support for training of blind people and for the development of techniques and devices that make lives of sightless people easier. But only recently has there been a full realization that through research a large proportion of blindness can be prevented. While encouraging further aid to the sightless, the committee firmly believes that an expanded research effort related to the multiple causes of blindness is long overdue.

#### SERVICE AND SUPPLY FUND

Original estimate.....	\$200, 000
Revised estimate.....	200, 000
House allowance.....	<sup>1</sup> 200, 000
Committee recommendation.....	<sup>2</sup> 200, 000

<sup>1</sup> To be derived by transfer from 1954 funds available to the National Institutes of Health.

<sup>2</sup> To be derived by transfer from unobligated balances of 1953 appropriations of the National Institutes of Health.

The committee recommends the striking of the language after the words "to be derived by transfer from such" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

*unobligated balances of 1953 appropriations of the National Institutes of Health as the Surgeon General may determine, to be available without fiscal year limitation: Provided, That supplies, materials, stocks, and equipment heretofore or hereafter derived by transfers to this fund may also be used to capitalize said fund: Provided further, That such funds may be reimbursed in advance from available funds of organizations covering estimated or actual charges for services, supplies, and materials furnished and operating expenses, including reserves for accrued annual leave.*

#### ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

##### CONSTRUCTION, MAXIMUM SECURITY BUILDING

Original estimate.....	\$195, 000
Revised estimate.....	195, 000
House allowance.....	0

The committee concurs in the action of the House allowing no funds for the preparation of plans and specifications for a maximum security building. The House committee had a comment in its report that it was "not disposed to recommend any further appropriations for buildings so long as Federal patients are a minor part of the patient load and Federal funds bear 100 percent of the cost of construction."

The committee will expect the officials of St. Elizabeths Hospital to begin negotiations with the agencies, for whose patients care is furnished on a reimbursable basis, to effect some cooperative arrangement for the construction of this building for which there is a vital need.

## CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT OF TREATMENT BUILDING

In the 1953 Appropriation Act funds were provided in the amount of \$6,125,000 for a treatment building, with the following proviso: "of which not to exceed \$300,000 shall be used for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a chapel."

The committee is advised that the Bureau of the Budget has placed this \$300,000 in reserve, and has recommended the rescission of the funds, which recommendation was disallowed by the House committee in reporting this bill.

The committee directs that work be started immediately on the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a chapel. There was an explicit direction in the 1953 act that the chapel should be built without making it contingent upon the concurrence of the Bureau of the Budget in the congressional direction.

## SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

## CONSTRUCTION, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

Original estimate <sup>1</sup> -----	\$1, 500, 000
Revised estimate-----	1, 500, 000
House allowance-----	1, 500, 000

<sup>1</sup> To be derived by transfer from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

The committee recommends the striking of the following language:

: *Provided*, That appropriations for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to the General Services Administration, but the selection of the site and the building plans shall be subject to approval by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the total cost of the project herein authorized shall not exceed \$27,000,000, but this limitation may be exceeded, or shall be reduced, by an amount equal to the percentage increase or decrease, if any, in construction costs generally dating from January 1, 1953, as determined by the Administrator of General Services

The House Committee on Appropriations in its report on the First Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, H. R. 4663, commented that it felt "that the Government will not only obtain more economical, but better service by returning to the policy of retaining competitively independent architects for the design and construction of all public buildings." This committee in its report, No. 237, on the same bill commented that it "agrees with the statement in the House report that the Government will not only obtain more economical, but better service by retaining competitively independent architects for the design and construction of all public buildings." In furtherance of this expression the first proviso in this item is stricken and the committee directs the Bureau to arrange for the retaining of competitively independent architects for this building.

The second proviso was stricken because the Congress has been advised as follows by the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: (1) in 1948 that the cost of the building would be \$9,500,000; (2) in 1950 that the cost would be \$11,500,000; (3) in 1951 that the cost would be \$13,915,000; (4) in 1952 that the cost would be \$17,000,000; and (5) in 1953 that the cost will be \$27,000,000.

The committee admonishes the Bureau to see that every economy is effected. In view of the fact that this committee originally approved funds, in the 1953 bill, for the preliminary planning on the basis of an estimated cost of \$17,000,000, it still feels that the total cost should



not exceed that figure, adjusted for any increased construction costs since the end of fiscal year 1952 and the cost of land, which cost was not included in the total estimated cost last year.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

1953 appropriation.....	\$1, 600, 000
Original estimate.....	1, 650, 000
Revised estimate.....	1, 650, 000
House allowance.....	1, 600, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 550, 000

The committee recommends a reduction of \$50,000 under the House allowance and \$100,000 under the budget estimate.

The committee is unable to discern any results from its suggestions in the past several years, accompanying its recommendations for increased allowances, that the Bureau make a concerted effort to impress upon the States the necessity for effecting every economy.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, CHILDREN'S BUREAU

1953 appropriation.....	\$1, 550, 000
Original estimate.....	1, 585, 000
Revised estimate.....	1, 550, 000
House allowance.....	1, 500, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 450, 000

The committee recommends a reduction of \$50,000 under the House allowance and \$100,000 under the revised estimate.

#### GRANTS TO STATES FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD WELFARE

1953 appropriation.....	\$28, 600, 000
Original estimate.....	32, 600, 000
Revised estimate.....	30, 600, 000
House allowance.....	30, 000, 000

The committee concurs with the House action, allowing \$30,000,000 for this program.

The committee recommends the addition of a proviso at the conclusion of the item as follows:

*Provided further, That, in computing allotments to States under sections 502, 512, and 521 (a) of such Act for the current fiscal year, balances in allotments previously made to States which remain available in the Federal Treasury for payment to them as of July 1, 1953, shall be taken into account by (1) adding the total of such balances to the appropriation herein made, and (2) subtracting from each resulting allotment to any State under section 502 (a), 512 (a), or 521 (a) any balance in any prior allotment under such section which remains available in the Federal Treasury for payment to it as of such date but with such adjustments as may be necessary to assure that this proviso does not operate to deprive any State of any balance in an allotment previously made to it under such section.*

The purpose of this amendment is to insure the fullest possible use of the new funds appropriated for 1954 without depriving any State of its carryover balance from the 1952 appropriation. The carryover balances are concentrated in a few States—2 States in the maternal and child health program, 6 in the crippled children's program, and 8 in the child welfare program.

If this amendment is not agreed to it means that these few States will receive substantial additional amounts for 1954 even though they are not yet able to use the full amount now available to them.

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1953 appropriation-----	\$950,000
OASI transfer-----	143,000
Original estimate-----	1,120,000
OASI transfer-----	180,000
Revised estimate-----	1,226,000
OASI transfer-----	200,000
House allowance-----	1,075,000
OASI transfer-----	168,000
Committee recommendation-----	1,075,000
OASI transfer-----	175,000

The committee recommends an increase of \$7,000 in the OASI transfer over the House allowance.

The committee has given consideration to three factors involved in the justification of funds under this heading: (1) Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, creating the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, provides some additional positions, as well as higher salaries for comparable positions amounting to \$32,000 on an accrual basis; (2) a security program under the recent Executive order requires some staff; and (3) the importance of strengthening the budget and fiscal office as stated and strongly recommended by a letter from the General Accounting Office.

The full amount requested in the Senate appeal memorandum for executive direction is allowed together with the 29 positions. For the security office the committee feels that four positions with the amount shown in the revised estimate is sufficient. On the third item, budget and fiscal, for which 4 positions and a corresponding increase in funds was requested in the revised estimate, the committee feels that this operation should not be further weakened and directs that no reduction be made below the 1953 budget.

For Federal-State relations, a subactivity under the activity "Executive direction and program coordination," the requested increase of one position over 1953 is denied. The committee feels that the additional positions in executive direction will provide ample staff to cover this function. For "International relations," another subactivity, for which were requested two grade GS-15's for a 4-employee unit, 1 top position has been denied. Should this additional position be required, it is suggested that it be financed out of funds transferred, in excess of \$90,000, from other agencies. With international functions being performed in several of the constituent offices within the Department, and with 21 employees paid from State Department and other agency funds, 3 positions should suffice for coordinating this subactivity. With respect to the "Aging and geriatrics" subactivity, commendable as such program may be, it appears that the Department can, by the judicious utilization of qualified staff in the several constituent offices and with the three positions allowed in this appropriation, provide for sufficient and proper promotional activities—stimulation of aging studies by State and local governments and privately supported organizations. This is not to authorize the assessment of the constituent units for the cost of such program over and above the three positions allowed.

In lieu of statisticians in the Office of the Director of Administration, budgeted for in the activity "Administrative services," an increase of one position and corresponding funds have been allowed in the subactivity "Administrative methods." Five positions and ap-



proximately \$41,500 are allowed for the new Office of Director of Administration, replacing the Office of Executive Assistant with 2 positions in 1953. The Office of Personnel is allowed \$135,000, providing for 3 positions over the House allowance.

The committee has allowed the language which broadens the working capital fund authority and believes that with some of the former services provided under general services, such as mail and messenger, now to be performed on a reimbursable basis, with reduction proposed in central library services, and with the possibility of eliminating one additional chauffeur and the wider use of taxicabs, general services can be adequately sustained with about 105 positions and \$505,000 instead of 117 positions and \$569,563 proposed in the revised estimate.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

1953 appropriation	\$387, 500
OASI transfer	387, 500
Food and Drug transfer	25, 000
Original estimate	455, 000
OASI transfer	405, 000
Food and Drug transfer	25, 000
House allowance	350, 000
OASI transfer	355, 000
Food and Drug transfer	20, 000
Committee recommendation	350, 000
OASI transfer	375, 000
Food and Drug transfer	25, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$20,000 in the OASI transfer, and \$5,000 in the Food and Drug transfer over the House allowances.

#### SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

1953 appropriation	\$165, 000
Original estimate	255, 000
Revised estimate	255, 000
House allowance	450, 000
Committee recommendation	255, 000

The committee recommends the budget estimate, a reduction of \$195,000 under the House allowance.

The revised estimate is an increase of 54.54 percent over the 1953 appropriation, an increase adequate in the opinion of the committee to permit the unit to expand its compliance program.

#### WORKING CAPITAL FUND

*Working capital fund: The working capital fund established in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1953, shall hereafter be available for financing such central services as the Secretary determines may be performed more advantageously on a reimbursable basis.*

The committee recommends the inclusion of this item in the bill. This central fund was initially established in 1953 in order to provide a smoother flow of work and more economical performance in these repetitious type of operations. The present language appears to limit the centralized operation to reproduction, tabulating, and supply. There are several other services which the Department desires to include in this authority to provide for more efficient operation. Among these are centralized postage-meter services; purchase of legislative materials from the Government Printing Office; and mail and messenger services.

## REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

## GRANTS FOR SURVEYS AND SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The committee recommends the rescission of the amount unexpended on "June 30, 1954", rather than on "the date of approval of this act."

The amount of \$3,000,000 originally appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, for this purpose was unexpended by \$1,367,698 on June 1, 1953. The change in date recommended by the committee would enable the States and Territories a reasonable period in which to receive amounts which have been allotted and agreed to by the Office of Education, and provide for the completion of the School Facilities Survey as authorized by title I of Public Law 815, 81st Congress. On the basis of information furnished the committee, 27 States would fail to receive their full allotments.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

## TRAVEL EXPENSES

The committee recommends an increase in the limitation on funds to be available for travel expenses for attendance at meetings, from \$25,000 to \$100,000. The Department estimates its expenditures in the current fiscal year for this purpose at \$203,317, and its estimates for 1954 contained \$188,550 for this purpose.

The committee also recommends the inclusion of a provision at the conclusion of the section, as follows:

*Provided, That hereafter appropriations to the Public Health Service for salaries and expenses shall be available for reimbursement to commissioned officers of the Service for the use of taxicabs and other means of conveyance (including reimbursement for use of privately owned vehicles) within and around their designated posts of duty, such reimbursement to be on the same basis and subject to the same limitations as for civilian officers and employees.*

## TRANSFER AUTHORITY

*SEC. 207. In order to more effectively administer the programs and functions of the Department, the Secretary is authorized to transfer not to exceed 2½ per centum of any appropriation in this title available for salaries and expenses to any other such appropriation but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 2½ per centum by any such transfer: Provided, That no such transfers shall be used for the creation of new functions within the Department.*

The committee recommends the inclusion of this section in the bill, similar to that inserted for the Department of Labor, except that the transfer from any one account is limited to 2½ percent rather than 5 percent permitted the Department of Labor. The committee will expect the Department to report to it the details with respect to each use of the transfer authority.

## TERMINAL LEAVE

*SEC. 208. Terminal leave: On request of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer such amounts as may be necessary, but not to exceed a total of \$300,000, from unobligated balances of appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, fiscal year 1953, to an appropriation account to be established for the payment of annual leave of employees separated from the service as a result of reductions of appropriations provided herein, in excess of the average turnover of employees in said Department over the period 1947-1952, to remain available until December 31, 1953.*

This provision would make funds available to pay terminal leave of employees separated as a result of reduced appropriations. Similar provisions were adopted for other departments.



## PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS, GENERAL AND SPECIAL FUNDS

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1953	Estimates, 1954	Increase (+), decrease (-)
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
American Printing House for the Blind (act of June 25, 1906)-----	\$10,000	\$10,000	
Office of Education:			
Payments to States and Territories for colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts (act of Mar. 4, 1907)-----	2,550,000	2,550,000	
Payments to States for promotion of vocational education (act of Feb. 23, 1917)-----	7,150,123	7,138,331	-\$11,792
Total, Office of Education-----	9,700,123	9,688,331	-11,792
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare-----	9,710,123	9,698,331	-11,792
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD			
Payment to railroad retirement account-----	683,000,000	694,852,000	+11,852,000
Railroad Unemployment Insurance Administration fund-----	11,000,000	11,000,000	
Total, Railroad Retirement Board-----	694,000,000	705,852,000	+11,852,000
Total permanent appropriations, all agencies-----	703,710,123	715,550,331	+11,840,208

# TRUST FUNDS

[Not a charge against general revenue]

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1953	Estimates, 1954	Increase (+), decrease (-)
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
Bureau of Employees' Compensation:			
Relief and rehabilitation, Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended.....	\$36,000	\$36,000	-----
Relief and rehabilitation, Workmen's Compensation Act, within the District of Columbia.....	9,000	9,000	-----
Bureau of Labor Statistics: Special statistical work.....	28,700	-----	-\$28,700
Total, Department of Labor.....	73,700	45,000	-----
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
Public Health Service:			
Patients benefit fund, Public Health Service hospitals.....	1,000	1,000	-----
Public Health Service conditional gift fund.....	25	-----	-25
Public Health Service unconditional gift fund.....	52,520	51,730	-790
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	53,545	52,730	-815
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD			
Railroad retirement account.....	773,324,469	788,752,000	+20,427,531
Total trust funds, all agencies.....	773,451,714	793,849,730	+20,398,016



COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1953, ORIGINAL AND REVISED ESTIMATES FOR 1954,  
AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1954

Agency or item	Appropriation, 1953	Original budget estimates, 1954	Revised budget estimates, 1954	Amount allowed by the House	Amount recommended by the Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with			
						Appropriation, 1953	Original estimate, 1954	Revised estimate, 1954	House bill
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR									
Office of the Secretary:									
Salaries and expenses.....	\$1,663,000	\$1,585,000	\$1,525,000	\$1,250,000	\$1,250,000	-\$413,000	-\$335,000	-\$275,000	-----
Office of the Solicitor.....	1,764,600	1,764,600	1,714,600	1,350,000	1,350,000	-414,600	-414,600	-364,600	-----
Bureau of Labor Standards.....	838,000	998,000	928,000	624,000	700,000	-138,000	-298,000	-228,000	+\$76,000
Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights.....	285,700	346,000	342,000	300,000	300,000	+14,300	-46,000	-42,000	-----
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	4,551,300	4,693,600	4,509,600	3,524,000	3,600,000	-951,300	-1,093,600	-909,600	+76,000
Bureau of Apprenticeship.....	3,379,009	3,400,000	3,324,000	3,400,000	3,230,000	-139,000	-170,000	-94,000	-170,000
Bureau of Employment Security:									
Salaries and expenses.....	5,679,000	5,867,000	5,435,000	5,100,000	5,275,000	-454,000	-642,000	-210,000	+125,000
Grants to States.....	197,110,000	218,000,000	213,600,000	187,300,000	197,110,000	-1,455,000	-20,800,000	-16,490,000	+9,810,000
Mexican farm labor.....	2,705,000	1,740,000	1,600,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	+11,300,000	-8,500,000	-2,500,000	-2,500,000
Unemployment compensation for veterans.....	27,200,000	47,000,000	41,000,000	41,000,000	38,500,000	+9,391,000	-30,522,000	-19,550,000	+7,435,000
Total, Bureau of Employment Security.....	232,694,000	272,607,000	261,635,000	234,650,000	242,085,000	+9,391,000	-30,522,000	-19,550,000	+7,435,000
Bureau of Employees' Compensation:									
Salaries and expenses.....	2,221,100	2,180,000	2,131,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	-221,100	-180,000	-131,000	-----
Employees' compensation fund, annual indefinite.....	55,000,000	55,000,000	56,600,000	56,500,000	56,500,000	+1,500,000	+1,500,000	-----	-----
Bureau of Labor Statistics.....	5,779,000	5,939,000	5,627,000	5,250,000	5,345,000	-434,000	-594,000	-282,000	+95,000
Women's Bureau.....	360,000	360,000	350,000	360,000	350,000	-10,000	-10,000	-----	-10,000
Wage and Hour Division.....	7,639,139	7,639,000	7,339,000	6,000,000	6,250,000	-1,389,139	-1,389,000	-1,089,000	+250,000
Total, Department of Labor.....	256,613,539	296,818,600	284,915,600	255,184,000	262,860,000	+6,246,461	-33,958,600	-22,055,600	+7,676,000

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE									
American Printing House for the Blind.....	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000				
Columbia Institution for the Deaf:									
Salaries and expenses.....	413,000	417,000	410,000	410,000	410,000	-3,000	-7,000		
Construction of buildings.....	90,000		41,000			-49,000	+41,000		+41,000
Total, Columbia Institution for the Deaf.....	503,000	417,000	451,000	410,000	410,000	-52,000	+34,000		+41,000
Food and Drug Administration:									
Salaries and expenses.....	5,600,000	5,663,000	5,648,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-400,000	-463,000	-448,000	+200,000
Certification and inspection services.....	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000		1,050,000				
Freedmen's Hospital:									
Salaries and expenses.....	2,860,750	3,196,000	3,104,000	3,104,000	3,104,000	+243,250	-92,000		
Facilities planning.....		50,000					-50,000		
Total, Freedmen's Hospital.....	2,860,750	3,246,000	3,104,000	3,104,000	3,104,000	+243,250	-142,000		
Howard University:									
Salaries and expenses.....	2,675,000	2,750,000	2,535,000	2,535,000	2,535,000	-140,000	-215,000		
Plans and specifications.....	30,000	55,000	30,000			-30,000	-55,000	-30,000	
Construction of buildings.....	280,221	170,000	170,000	20,000	170,000	-110,221			+150,000
Construction of buildings, liquidation of contract authority.....	1,061,779	1,900,000				-1,061,779	-1,900,000		
Total, Howard University.....	4,047,000	4,875,000	2,735,000	2,555,000	2,705,000	-1,342,000	-2,170,000	-30,000	+150,000
Office of Education:									
Promotion and further development of vocational education.....	18,641,261	18,673,261	14,048,870	18,673,261	18,673,261	+32,000		+4,624,391	
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts.....	2,480,000	2,501,500	2,501,500	2,501,500	2,501,500	+21,500			
Salaries and expenses.....	2,992,000	3,250,000	2,926,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-492,000	-750,000	-426,000	
Payments to school districts.....	60,500,000	70,000,000	66,500,000	66,500,000	66,500,000	+6,000,000	-3,500,000		



*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1953, original and revised estimates for 1954, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1954—Continued*

Agency or item	Appropriation, 1953	Original budget estimates, 1954	Revised budget estimates, 1954	Amount allowed by the House	Amount recommended by the Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—			
						Appropriation, 1953	Original estimate, 1954	Revised estimate, 1954	House bill
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—continued									
Office of Education—Continued									
School construction.....	\$195,000,000					—\$195,000,000			
Total, Office of Education.....	279,613,261	\$94,424,761	\$85,976,370	\$90,174,761	\$90,174,761	—189,438,500		+\$4,198,391	
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation:									
Payments to States.....	22,250,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	21,850,000	—400,000	—1,150,000	—1,150,000	—\$1,150,000
Salaries and expenses.....	700,000	725,000	690,000	690,000	655,500	—44,500	—69,500	—34,500	—34,500
Total, office of Vocational Rehabilitation.....	22,950,000	23,725,000	23,690,000	23,690,000	22,505,500	—444,500	—1,219,500	—1,184,500	—1,184,500
Public Health Service:									
Control of venereal diseases.....	9,800,000	8,325,000	6,695,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	—4,800,000	—3,325,000	—1,695,000	
Control of tuberculosis.....	8,240,000	7,645,000	5,725,000	5,725,000	5,725,000	—2,515,000	—1,920,000		
Assistance to States, general.....	16,200,000	16,315,000	16,215,000	13,250,000	13,250,000	—2,950,000	—3,065,000	—2,965,000	
Control of communicable diseases.....	5,919,750	5,735,000	5,335,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	—919,750	—735,000	—335,000	
Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene.....	3,700,000	3,985,000	3,850,000	3,000,000	3,325,000	—375,000	—600,000	—525,000	+325,000
Grants, water pollution control.....		900,000					—900,000		
Disease and sanitation investigation and control, Territory of Alaska.....	1,107,500	1,107,000	1,082,000	1,082,000	1,082,000	—25,500	—25,000		
Grants for hospital construction.....	75,000,000	75,000,000	60,000,000	50,000,000	60,000,000	—15,000,000	—15,000,000		+10,000,000
Grants for hospital construction, liquidation of contract authority.....	59,700,000	19,804,000	19,700,000	19,700,000	19,700,000	—40,000,000	—104,000		

Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services.....	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,125,000	750,000	1,000,000	-200,000	-200,000	-125,000	+250,000
Hospitals and medical care.....	33,688,000	35,224,000	33,551,000	32,500,000	32,500,000	-1,188,000	-2,724,000	-1,051,000	-----
Foreign quarantine service.....	3,065,000	3,100,000	3,050,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	-165,000	-200,000	-150,000	-----
Operating expenses, National Institutes of Health.....	16,598,750	5,180,000	4,675,000	4,675,000	4,675,000	-11,923,750	-505,000	-----	-----
National Cancer Institute.....	17,887,000	22,000,000	15,780,000	17,887,000	20,487,000	+2,600,000	-1,513,000	+4,707,000	+2,600,000
Mental-health activities.....	10,895,000	15,500,000	9,817,000	10,895,000	12,345,000	+1,450,000	-3,155,000	+2,528,000	+1,450,000
National Heart Institute.....	12,000,000	16,500,000	11,040,000	12,000,000	15,418,000	+3,418,000	-1,082,000	+4,378,000	+3,418,000
Dental-health activities.....	1,650,000	2,700,000	1,740,000	1,650,000	1,740,000	+90,000	-990,000	-----	+90,000
Arthritis and metabolic-disease activities.....	-----	8,450,000	4,976,000	5,000,000	7,000,000	+7,000,000	-1,450,000	+2,024,000	+2,000,000
Microbiology activities.....	-----	7,000,000	5,738,000	5,479,200	5,738,000	+5,738,000	-1,262,000	-----	+258,800
Neurology and blindness activities.....	-----	7,670,000	2,574,000	4,000,000	4,750,000	+4,750,000	-2,920,000	+2,176,000	+750,000
Construction of research facilities (liquidation of contract authority).....	3,230,000	3,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-730,000	-500,000	-----	-----
Retired pay of commissioned officers.....	1,186,000	1,215,000	1,197,000	1,197,000	1,197,000	+11,000	-18,000	-----	-----
Salaries and expenses.....	3,170,250	3,138,000	3,100,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	-270,250	-238,000	-200,000	-----
Buildings and facilities, Clinchnatl.....	300,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-300,000	-----	-----	-----
Service and supply fund.....	-----	200,000	200,000	-----	-----	-----	-200,000	-200,000	-----
Total, Public Health Service.....	284,537,250	270,893,000	219,665,000	207,090,200	228,232,000	-56,305,250	-42,661,000	+8,567,000	+21,141,800
St. Elizabeths Hospital:									
Salaries and expenses.....	2,520,000	2,428,500	2,417,000	2,417,000	2,417,000	-103,000	-11,500	-----	-----
Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds.....	136,500	451,500	389,500	399,500	399,500	+263,000	-52,000	-----	-----
Construction, maximum security building.....	-----	195,000	195,000	-----	-----	-----	-195,000	-195,000	-----
Construction and equipment of treatment building.....	6,125,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-6,125,000	-----	-----	-----
Total, St. Elizabeths Hospital.....	8,781,500	3,075,000	3,011,500	2,816,500	2,816,500	-5,965,000	-238,500	-195,000	-----



*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1953, original and revised estimates for 1954, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1954—Continued*

Agency or item	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with					
	Appropriation, 1953	Original budget estimates, 1954	Revised budget estimates, 1954	Amount allowed by the House	Amount recommended by the Senate committee	House bill
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—continued						
Social Security Administration:						
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (trust account).....	\$62,500,000	\$64,000,000	\$64,000,000	\$62,750,000	\$62,750,000	—\$1,250,000
Construction of building, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (trust fund).....		1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	
Grants to States for public assistance.....	1,340,000,000	1,340,000,000	1,340,000,000	1,340,000,000	1,340,000,000	
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance.....	1,600,000	1,650,000	1,650,000	1,600,000	1,550,000	—\$50,000
Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau.....	1,550,000	1,585,000	1,550,000	1,500,000	1,450,000	—100,000
Grants to States for maternal and child welfare.....	28,600,000	32,600,000	30,600,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	—2,600,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of Commissioner.....	185,000	190,000	173,000	173,000	173,000	—17,000
Transfer from OASI trust fund.....	109,000	135,000	123,500	123,500	123,500	—11,500
Bureau of Federal Credit Unions:						
Salaries and expenses.....	200,000					
Supervision of Federal credit unions, special account.....	1,048,894	1,339,592	1,339,592	1,339,592	1,339,592	
Operating fund.....		250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	
Total, Social Security Administration.....	1,372,135,000	1,376,275,000	1,374,223,000	1,373,523,000	1,373,423,000	—2,852,000
						—100,000

Office of the Secretary:										
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary	950,000	1,120,000	1,225,000	1,075,000	1,075,000	+125,000	-45,000	-151,000	-151,000	-----
Transfer from OASI trust fund	143,000	180,000	200,000	168,000	175,000	+32,000	-5,000	-25,000	-25,000	+7,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services	1,835,000	1,930,000	1,930,000	1,835,000	1,835,000	-----	-95,000	-95,000	-95,000	-----
Transfer from OASI trust fund	375,000	415,000	415,000	375,000	375,000	-----	-38,000	-38,000	-38,000	-----
Salaries and expenses, Office of General Counsel	387,500	455,000	455,000	350,000	350,000	-37,500	-105,000	-105,000	-105,000	-----
Transfer from OASI trust fund	387,500	405,000	405,000	355,000	375,000	-12,500	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000	+40,000
Transfer from Food and Drug	25,000	25,000	25,000	20,000	25,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	+5,000
Surplus property disposal	165,000	255,000	255,000	450,000	255,000	+90,000	-----	-----	-----	-195,000
Working capital fund	50,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-50,000	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, Office of Secretary	3,387,500	3,760,000	3,865,000	3,710,000	3,515,000	+127,500	-245,000	-351,000	-351,000	-195,000
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	1,984,590,261	1,786,528,761	1,722,544,870	1,712,248,461	1,732,301,761	-252,288,500	-54,227,000	+9,755,891	+9,755,891	+20,053,300
RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES										
National Labor Relations Board: Salaries and expenses	9,000,000	9,800,000	9,500,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	-----	-800,000	-500,000	-500,000	-----
National Mediation Board:	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Salaries and expenses	420,000	441,000	438,000	429,000	429,000	-----	-12,000	-9,000	-9,000	-----
Arbitration and emergency boards	148,000	138,000	148,000	138,000	138,000	-10,000	-----	-10,000	-10,000	-----
National Railroad Adjustment Board, salaries and expenses	553,000	589,000	497,000	497,000	497,000	-56,000	-92,000	-----	-----	-----
Total, National Mediation Board	1,130,000	1,168,000	1,083,000	1,064,000	1,064,000	-66,000	-104,000	-19,000	-19,000	-----
Railroad Retirement Board: Salaries and expenses (trust fund)	6,207,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	6,207,000	6,207,000	-----	-193,000	-193,000	-193,000	-----
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service:	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Salaries and expenses	3,400,000	3,700,000	3,450,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	-200,000	-500,000	-290,000	-290,000	-----
Boards of inquiry	47,500	47,500	10,000	10,000	10,000	-37,500	-37,500	-----	-----	-----
Total, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	3,447,500	3,747,500	3,470,000	3,210,000	3,210,000	-237,500	-537,500	-280,000	-280,000	-----
Grand total	2,254,781,300	2,098,062,861	2,021,513,470	1,980,706,461	2,008,435,761	-246,345,539	-89,627,100	-13,077,709	-13,077,709	+27,729,300





Calendar No. 479

83<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 5246

[Report No. 478]

---

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 27 (legislative day, MAY 21), 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JUNE 29 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1953

Reported by Mr. THYE, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4       in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-  
5       ments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and  
6       related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June  
7       30, 1954, namely:



## 1 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

## 2 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
4 Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title re-  
5 ferred to as the Secretary), including services as authorized  
6 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.  
7 55a); teletype news service; any payment in advance when  
8 authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library  
9 membership in organizations whose publications are avail-  
10 able to members only or to members at a price lower than to  
11 the general public; \$1,250,000.

## 12 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

13 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
14 Office of the Solicitor, \$1,350,000: *Provided, That the com-*  
15 *ensation of the Solicitor shall be \$14,800 per annum Pro-*  
16 *vided, That hereafter the compensation of the Solicitor shall*  
17 *be at a rate equal to the rate established by law for grade*  
18 *GS-18.*

## 19 BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
21 promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and  
22 amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; per-  
23 formance of safety functions of the Secretary under the  
24 Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5  
25 U. S. C. 784 (c) ); performance of the functions vested in

1 the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations  
 2 Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)) ; and not to ex-  
 3 ceed \$70,000 for the work of the President's Committee on  
 4 National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as au-  
 5 thorized by the Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), in-  
 6 cluding purchase of reports and of material for informational  
 7 exhibits *and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials*  
 8 *and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the*  
 9 *Bureau of Labor Standards; ~~\$624,000~~ \$700,000.*

#### 10 BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

11 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to render  
 12 assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment  
 13 rights under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service  
 14 Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 308), the Serv-  
 15 ice Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army Reserve  
 16 and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as amended,  
 17 and section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Serv-  
 18 ice Act, and, under the Act of June 23, 1943, as amended  
 19 (50 U. S. C. App. 1472), of persons who have performed  
 20 service in the Merchant Marine, \$300,000.

#### 21 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

22 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to en-  
 23 able the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging  
 24 apprentice training, as authorized by the Act of August 16,  
 25 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50), ~~\$3,400,000~~ \$3,230,000.



## 1 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

2 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
3 general administration of the employment service and un-  
4 employment compensation programs, including temporary  
5 employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service  
6 laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program;  
7 and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by sec-  
8 tion 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ;  
9 ~~\$5,100,000~~ \$5,225,000, of which \$981,000 shall be for  
10 carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except section  
11 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

12 Grants to States for unemployment compensation and  
13 employment service administration: For grants in accord-  
14 ance with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as  
15 amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect  
16 section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944,  
17 for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the  
18 Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503),  
19 including, upon the request of any State, the purchase of  
20 equipment and the payment of rental for space made avail-  
21 able to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, for  
22 necessary expenses in connection with the operation of em-  
23 ployment office facilities and services in the District of  
24 Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for,  
25 necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjust-

1 ment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684), \$187,300,—  
2 ~~000~~ \$197,110,000, of which \$10,000,000 shall be available  
3 only to the extent that the Secretary finds necessary to meet  
4 increased costs of administration resulting from changes in  
5 a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and  
6 claims paid *or salary costs* over those upon which the State's  
7 basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Columbia)  
8 was based, which increased costs of administration cannot  
9 be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments: *Pro-*  
10 *vided*, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary  
11 in section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended,  
12 the Secretary of Labor shall from time to time certify to  
13 the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State  
14 found to be in compliance with the requirements of the  
15 Act of June 6, 1933, and, except in the case of Puerto Rico  
16 and the Virgin Islands, with the provisions of section 303  
17 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts as he  
18 determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient ad-  
19 ministration of its unemployment compensation law and of  
20 its public employment offices: *Provided further*, That such  
21 amounts as may be agreed upon by the Department of Labor  
22 and the Post Office Department shall be used for the pay-  
23 ment, in such manner as said parties may jointly determine,  
24 of postage for the transmission of official mail matter in con-  
25 nection with the administration of unemployment compensa-



1 tion systems and employment services by States receiving  
2 grants herefrom.

3 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,  
4 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social  
5 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and  
6 maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall  
7 apply.

8 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the  
9 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State  
10 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation  
11 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of offi-  
12 cers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from  
13 the said agencies of any States which have established by  
14 legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system  
15 and classification and compensation plan covering the selec-  
16 tion, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees,  
17 because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner  
18 of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the  
19 rates of pay of said officers or employees.

20 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-  
21 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to  
22 States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended,  
23 and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first  
24 quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may  
25 be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures

1 made thereunder for payments under such title and under  
 2 such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the appropriation  
 3 therefor for that fiscal year.

4 Unemployment compensation for veterans: For pay-  
 5 ments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV  
 6 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952,  
 7 ~~\$41,000,000~~ \$38,500,000.

8 Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program: For  
 9 expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out  
 10 the functions of the Department of Labor under the Act of  
 11 July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78), including temporary em-  
 12 ployment of persons without regard to the civil service laws,  
 13 \$1,250,000.

14 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

15 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative  
 16 expenses and not to exceed \$87,000 for the Employees'  
 17 Compensation Appeals Board, \$2,000,000, together with  
 18 not to exceed \$90,000 to be derived from the War Claims  
 19 Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of  
 20 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

21 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of  
 22 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except ad-  
 23 ministrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing dur-  
 24 ing the current or any prior fiscal year, including payments  
 25 to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital services



1 pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of Em-  
2 ployees' Compensation; continuation of payment of bene-  
3 fits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits"  
4 in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947;  
5 the advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in  
6 third-party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital  
7 services and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial ex-  
8 penses, including transportation and other expenses in-  
9 cidental to such services, treatment, and burial, for such  
10 enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified  
11 by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital services  
12 and treatment at Government expense on June 30, 1943,  
13 and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian em-  
14 ployees of the United States, and the limitations and  
15 authority of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended  
16 (5 U. S. C. 796), shall apply in providing such services,  
17 treatment, and expenses in such cases; such amount as  
18 may be required during the current fiscal year: *Provided*,  
19 That this appropriation shall be available for payments pur-  
20 suant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of the War Claims Act  
21 of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012) and shall be credited with  
22 advances or reimbursements therefor from the War Claims  
23 Fund created by section 13 (a) of said War Claims Act of  
24 1948.

## BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), ~~\$5,250,000~~ \$5,345,000.

## WOMEN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of reports and material for informational exhibits, ~~\$360,000~~ \$350,000.

## WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for performing the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at con-



1 ferences concerned with the work of the Division, \$6,000,000  
2 \$6,250,000.

3 GENERAL PROVISIONS

4 SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for  
5 salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic  
6 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
7 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), for examination of esti-  
8 mates of appropriations in the field, and for expenses of  
9 attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activ-  
10 ity for which any such appropriation is made.

11 *SEC. 103. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appro-*  
12 *priation in this title may be transferred to any other such*  
13 *appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased*  
14 *by more than 5 per centum by any such transfer: Provided,*  
15 *That no such transfer shall be used for creation of new func-*  
16 *tions within the Department.*

17 *SEC. 104. Terminal leave: On request of the Secretary*  
18 *of Labor, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to*  
19 *transfer such amounts as may be necessary, but not to exceed*  
20 *\$300,000, from unobligated balances of appropriations for*  
21 *the Department of Labor, fiscal year 1953, to an appropria-*  
22 *tion account to be established for the payment of annual leave*  
23 *of employees separated from the service as a result of reduc-*  
24 *tions of appropriations provided herein in excess of the*  
25 *average turn-over of employees in said Department over the*

1 *period 1947-1952, to remain available until December 31,*  
2 *1953.*

3 This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor  
4 Appropriation Act, 1954".

5 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
6 EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

7 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

8 Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of  
9 August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), \$175,000.

10 COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

11 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of  
12 Columbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal serv-  
13 ices and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improve-  
14 ments, \$410,000: *Provided*, That the Columbia Institution  
15 for the Deaf, shall be paid by the District of Columbia, in  
16 advance at the beginning of each quarter, at the rate of  
17 \$1,150 per school year for each student attending said In-  
18 stitution pursuant to the Act of March 1, 1901 (31 D. C.  
19 Code 1008).

20 *For an additional amount for the construction of build-*  
21 *ings to accommodate deaf children at the Columbia Institution*  
22 *for the Deaf, \$41,100.*

23 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

24 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for car-  
25 rying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as



1 amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392) ; the Tea Importation Act,  
2 as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50) ; the Import Milk Act  
3 (21 U. S. C. 141-149) ; the Federal Caustic Poison Act  
4 (15 U. S. C. 401-411) ; and the Filled Milk Act, as  
5 amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64) ; reporting and illustrating  
6 the results of investigations ; purchase of chemicals, appa-  
7 ratus, and scientific equipment ; not to exceed \$2,000 for  
8 payment in advance for special test and analyses by contract ;  
9 and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection with  
10 studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug  
11 enforcement operations ; ~~\$5,000,000~~ \$5,200,000.

12 Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection serv-  
13 ices : For expenses necessary for the certification or in-  
14 spection of certain products in accordance with sections  
15 406, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food,  
16 Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346,  
17 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of  
18 the advance deposits during the current fiscal year to cover  
19 payment of fees by applicants for certification or inspection  
20 of such products, to remain available until expended. The  
21 total amount herein appropriated shall be available for  
22 personal services ; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and  
23 scientific equipment ; and the refund of advance deposits  
24 for which no service has been rendered.

## FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard University" for salaries of technical and professional personnel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such university; \$3,104,000: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary from any other appropriation in this title: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of



1 cational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools  
 2 as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public  
 3 Law 874), \$66,500,000: *Provided*, That this appropria-  
 4 tion shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of  
 5 section 6 of such Act.

6 *School construction: The amount made available under*  
 7 *this head in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1953,*  
 8 *for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other*  
 9 *agencies is increased from “\$750,000” to “\$1,250,000”.*

10 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

11 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and  
 12 Puerto Rico) : For payments to States (including Alaska,  
 13 Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Voca-  
 14 tional Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4),  
 15 including payments, in accordance with regulations of the  
 16 Secretary, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the  
 17 acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accord-  
 18 ance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for the use of  
 19 blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be con-  
 20 trolled by the State agency, ~~\$23,000,000~~ \$21,850,000, of  
 21 which not to exceed \$175,000 shall be available to the  
 22 Secretary for providing rehabilitation services to disabled  
 23 residents of the District of Columbia, as authorized by sec-  
 24 tion 6 of said Act, which latter amount shall be available  
 25 for administrative expenses in connection with providing

1 such services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That  
2 not to exceed 15 per centum of the appropriation shall be  
3 used for administrative purposes: *Provided further*, That  
4 after payment of amounts certified to be due for prior fiscal  
5 years, the funds herein appropriated shall be apportioned  
6 among the States in accordance with regulations promulgated  
7 by the Secretary to insure equitable maintenance and improve-  
8 ment of State programs; and the obligation of the United  
9 States to any State under such Act for fiscal year 1954 shall  
10 not exceed the amount so apportioned to such State.

11 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and  
12 Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making,  
13 after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States  
14 in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as  
15 amended (including the objects specified in the preceding  
16 paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding  
17 fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations  
18 incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be  
19 charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year:  
20 *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this para-  
21 graph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the  
22 first quarter of the current fiscal year.

23 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in car-  
24 rying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,



1 as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20  
2 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including not to exceed \$3,000 for pro-  
3 duction, purchase, and distribution of educational films;  
4 ~~\$690,000~~ \$655,500.

5 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

6 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public Health  
7 Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) (hereinafter  
8 referred to as the Act), and other Acts, including expenses  
9 for active commissioned officers in the Reserve Corps and  
10 for not to exceed one thousand five hundred commissioned  
11 officers in the Regular Corps; as follows:

12 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sec-  
13 tions 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal  
14 diseases including the operation and maintenance of centers  
15 for the diagnosis and treatment of persons afflicted with  
16 venereal diseases; and for grants of money, services, sup-  
17 plies, equipment, and use of facilities to States, as defined  
18 in the Act, and with the approval of the respective State  
19 health authorities, to counties, health districts, and other  
20 political subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes,  
21 in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the  
22 Surgeon General may determine; \$5,000,000.

23 Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314  
24 (b) of the Act, \$5,725,000.

25 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes,

1 not otherwise specifically provided for, of section 314 (c) of  
 2 the Act; to provide consultative services to States pursuant  
 3 to section 311 of the Act; to make field investigations and  
 4 demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the Act; and to  
 5 provide for collecting and compiling mortality, morbidity,  
 6 and vital statistics; \$13,250,000, *of which not more than*  
 7 *\$2,400,000 shall be available for personal services.*

8 Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as other-  
 9 wise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311,  
 10 and 361 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppres-  
 11 sion of communicable and preventable diseases, and the inter-  
 12 state transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase,  
 13 erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; and hire,  
 14 maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$5,000,000, *of which*  
 15 *not less than \$400,000 shall be used for studies, prevention,*  
 16 *and control activities on poliomyelitis.*

17 Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For  
 18 expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out  
 19 those provisions of sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of  
 20 the Act relating to sanitation and other aspects of environ-  
 21 mental health, including enforcement of applicable quaran-  
 22 tine laws and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carry-  
 23 ing out the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act  
 24 (33 U. S. C. 466-466 (j) ) ; ~~\$3,000,000~~ *\$3,325,000.*

25 . Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Ter-



1    ritory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct,  
 2    in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Terri-  
 3    tory of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the  
 4    investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases,  
 5    and the establishment and maintenance of health and sani-  
 6    tation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in  
 7    sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of  
 8    subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set  
 9    forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361 and 363 of the  
 10   Act, including the hire, operation, and maintenance of air-  
 11   craft, and the purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable  
 12   buildings, \$1,082,000.

13        Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hos-  
 14   pital construction under part C, title VI, of the Act, as  
 15   amended, to remain available until expended, ~~\$50,000,000~~  
 16   ~~\$60,000,000~~: *Provided*, That allotments under such part C  
 17   to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made  
 18   on the basis of an amount equal to the appropriation granted  
 19   herein.

20        Grants for hospital construction (liquidation of contract  
 21   authorization): For payment of obligations incurred under  
 22   authority heretofore granted under this head, \$19,700,000.

23        Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:  
 24   For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI  
 25   of the Act, as amended, ~~\$750,000~~ \$1,000,000.

1       Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the func-  
2       tions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August 8,  
3       1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), and under sections 321, 322, 324,  
4       326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the  
5       Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079  
6       of February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of  
7       farm products and livestock; conducting research on tech-  
8       nical nursing standards and furnishing consultative nursing  
9       services; and purchase of firearms and ammunition; \$32,-  
10      500,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall be exclusively available  
11     for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care and treat-  
12     ment of persons afflicted with leprosy: *Provided*, That when  
13     the Public Health Service establishes or operates a health  
14     service program for any department or agency, payment for  
15     the estimated cost shall be made in advance for deposit to  
16     the credit of this appropriation.

17      Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-  
18     poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to preventing  
19     the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign coun-  
20     tries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance with  
21     section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of  
22     quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the Act  
23     in private or other public hospitals when facilities of the  
24     Public Health Service are not available, including insurance



1 of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required  
2 by law of such countries; \$2,900,000.

3 National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For  
4 the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not other-  
5 wise provided for, including research fellowships and grants  
6 for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act;  
7 not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visiting scientists  
8 when specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection  
9 of temporary structures; and grants of therapeutic and  
10 chemical substances for demonstrations and research; \$4,675,-  
11 000: *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to  
12 advance to this appropriation from other appropriations to  
13 the Public Health Service such amounts as are determined  
14 to be necessary for the foregoing purposes and for activities  
15 performed on a centralized basis: *Provided further*, That the  
16 Surgeon General is authorized to operate facilities at the  
17 National Institutes of Health for the sale of meals to em-  
18 ployees and others ~~and the proceeds thereof may be credited~~  
19 ~~to this appropriation~~ *at rates determined by him to be sufficient*  
20 *to recover the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof*  
21 *shall be credited to this appropriation.*

22 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon Gen-  
23 eral, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory  
24 Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and train-  
25 ing projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State

1 health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit in-  
2 stitutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of can-  
3 cer by providing consultative services, demonstrations, and  
4 grants-in-aid; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of  
5 title IV, part A, of the Act; ~~\$17,887,000~~ *\$20,487,000*.

6 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for  
7 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311,  
8 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases,  
9 ~~\$10,895,000~~ *\$12,345,000*.

10 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to  
11 carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act,  
12 ~~\$12,000,000~~ *\$15,418,000*.

13 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise  
14 provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to  
15 carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental  
16 diseases and conditions, ~~\$1,650,000~~ *\$1,740,000*.

17 Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: For expenses  
18 necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to  
19 arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, ~~\$5,000,000~~  
20 *\$7,000,000*.

21 Microbiology activities: For expenses necessary to carry  
22 out the purposes of the Act relating to microbiology, includ-  
23 ing the regulation and preparation of biologic products,  
24 ~~\$5,479,200~~ *\$5,738,000*.

25 Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses neces-



1 sary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to neurology  
 2 and blindness, ~~\$4,000,000~~ \$4,750,000.

3 Construction of research facilities (liquidation of contract  
 4 authorization) : For payment of obligations incurred pur-  
 5 suant to authority granted to enter into contracts for con-  
 6 struction of a combined hospital and research building as  
 7 authorized in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation  
 8 Acts of 1949 and 1950, to be transferred to the General  
 9 Services Administration, \$2,500,000.

10 Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay  
 11 of commissioned officers, as authorized by law, \$1,197,000, to  
 12 remain available until expended: *Provided*, That hereafter  
 13 a commissioned officer of the Public Health Service who has  
 14 been retired may be recalled to active duty, other than in  
 15 time of war, with his consent.

16 Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of  
 17 the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous  
 18 expenses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for  
 19 elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and pub-  
 20 lications related to public health; conducting studies and  
 21 demonstrations in public health methods; and carrying on  
 22 international health activities, including not to exceed \$1,000  
 23 for entertainment of officials of other countries when specifi-  
 24 cally authorized by the Surgeon General; \$2,900,000.

25 Service and supply fund: For additional working capital

1 for the "Service and supply fund," created by title II of the  
2 Act of July 3, 1945 (42 U. S. C. 231), not to exceed  
3 \$200,000, to be derived by transfer from such other funds  
4 appropriated in this Act to the National Institutes of Health  
5 as the Surgeon General may determine, to remain available  
6 until expended: *Provided*, That any stocks of supplies and  
7 equipment of the Public Health Service related to services  
8 financed under this fund may also be used to capitalize said  
9 fund *unobligated balances of 1953 appropriations of the*  
10 *National Institutes of Health as the Surgeon General may*  
11 *determine, to be available without fiscal year limitation: Pro-*  
12 *vided, That supplies, materials, stocks, and equipment here-*  
13 *tofore or hereafter derived by transfers to this fund may also*  
14 *be used to capitalize said fund: Provided further, That such*  
15 *funds may be reimbursed in advance from available funds of*  
16 *organizations covering estimated or actual charges for serv-*  
17 *ices, supplies, and materials furnished and operating expenses,*  
18 *including reserves for accrued annual leave.*

19       Administrative provisions: During the current fiscal  
20 year, and with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,  
21 there may be transferred from any annual appropriation to  
22 the Public Health Service to any other such appropriation  
23 such additional amounts as may be required for pay and  
24 allowances of the active commissioned officers herein au-  
25 thorized, but any amounts so transferred shall not exceed



1 5 per centum of any such appropriation and no such appro-  
2 priation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum as a  
3 result of any such transfers.

4 SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
6 maintenance and operation of the hospital, including pur-  
7 chase of clothing for patients and cooperation with organ-  
8 izations or individuals in scientific research into the nature,  
9 causes, prevention and treatment of mental illness,  
10 \$2,417,000.

11 Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds:  
12 For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and  
13 equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including prep-  
14 aration of plans and specifications, advertising, and super-  
15 vision of construction, \$399,500: *Provided*, That any part  
16 of this amount may be transferred to the General Services  
17 Administration.

18 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

19 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors  
20 Insurance: For necessary expenses, including furnishing,  
21 repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equipment  
22 used by building guards; not more than \$62,750,000 may  
23 be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insur-  
24 ance trust fund.

25 Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insur-

1   ance: For ~~beginning preparing for~~ construction of an office  
 2   building and appurtenant facilities for the Bureau of Old-Age  
 3   and Survivors Insurance, including equipment, acquisition  
 4   of land (including donations thereof), and preparation of  
 5   plans and specifications, \$1,500,000, to be derived from the  
 6   Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and to  
 7   remain available until expended: ~~Provided, That~~ appropria-  
 8   tions for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to the  
 9   General Services Administration, but the selection of the site  
 10   and the building plans shall be subject to approval by the  
 11   Secretary: ~~Provided further, That~~ the total cost of the project  
 12   herein authorized shall not exceed \$27,000,000, but this  
 13   limitation may be exceeded, or shall be reduced, by an amount  
 14   equal to the percentage increase or decrease, if any, in con-  
 15   struction costs generally dating from January 1, 1953, as  
 16   determined by the Administrator of General Services.

17       Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to  
 18   States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid  
 19   to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled,  
 20   as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social  
 21   Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV,  
 22   X, and XIV), \$1,340,000,000, of which such amount as  
 23   may be necessary shall be available for grants for any period  
 24   in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year.

25       Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance:



1 For expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance,  
2 ~~\$1,600,000~~ \$1,550,000.

3 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary  
4 expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as  
5 amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6), and title V of the Social  
6 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),  
7 including purchase of reports and material for the publica-  
8 tions of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution,  
9 ~~\$1,500,000~~ \$1,450,000: *Provided*, That no part of any ap-  
10 propriation contained in this title shall be used to promul-  
11 gate or carry out any instructions, order, or regulation  
12 relating to the care of obstetrical cases which discriminate  
13 between persons licensed under State law to practice obstet-  
14 rics: *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not  
15 be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the  
16 services of any practitioner of her own choice, paid for out  
17 of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with: *Pro-*  
18 *vided further*, That any State plan which provides standards  
19 for professional obstetrical services in accordance with the  
20 laws of the State shall be approved.

21 Grants to States for material and child welfare: For  
22 grants to States for maternal and child-health services, serv-  
23 ices for crippled children, and child-welfare services as au-  
24 thorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security  
25 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),

1 \$30,000,000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pur-  
2 suant to section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not  
3 be included in computing for the purposes of subsections (a)  
4 and (b) of sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount  
5 expended or estimated to be expended by the State: *Pro-*  
6 *vided further, That, in computing allotments to States under*  
7 *sections 502, 512, and 521 (a) of such Act for the current*  
8 *fiscal year, balances in allotments previously made to States*  
9 *which remain available in the Federal Treasury for payment*  
10 *to them as of July 1, 1953, shall be taken into account by*  
11 *(1) adding the total of such balances to the appropriation*  
12 *herein made, and (2) subtracting from each resulting allot-*  
13 *ment to any State under section 502 (a), 512 (a), or 521*  
14 *(a) any balance in any prior allotment under such section*  
15 *which remains available in the Federal Treasury for pay-*  
16 *ment to it as of such date but with such adjustments as may*  
17 *be necessary to assure that this proviso does not operate to*  
18 *deprive any State of any balance in an allotment previously*  
19 *made to it under such section.*

20 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For  
21 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner for  
22 Social Security, \$173,000, together with not to exceed  
23 \$123,500 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and  
24 survivors insurance trust fund.

25 Operating fund, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions: For



1 additional working capital for the fund established by section  
2 5 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U. S. C. 1755),  
3 \$250,000, to be available for the purposes of such fund  
4 without fiscal year limitation: *Provided*, That this amount  
5 shall be treated as a loan to such fund and shall bear interest,  
6 payable annually, at a rate determined by the Secretary of  
7 the Treasury after taking into consideration the average rate  
8 of interest payable upon all marketable interest-bearing obli-  
9 gations of the United States: *Provided further*, That begin-  
10 ning not later than July 1, 1955, such amount shall be paid  
11 from such fund into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts  
12 at an annual rate of not less than one-tenth of such amount.

13 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-  
14 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to  
15 States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respectively, of  
16 the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter  
17 of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be neces-  
18 sary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made  
19 thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be  
20 charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

21 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, re-  
22 spectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, payments  
23 to a State under any of such titles for any quarter in the  
24 period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending June  
25 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to a State

1 plan approved under such title prior to or during such period,  
2 but no such payment shall be made with respect to any  
3 plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which such plan  
4 was submitted for approval.

5 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

6 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For ex-  
7 penses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, \$1,075,000,  
8 together with not to exceed ~~\$168,000~~ \$175,000 to be trans-  
9 ferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust  
10 fund.

11 Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services: For  
12 expenses necessary for the Office of Field Services, \$1,835,-  
13 000, together with not to exceed \$375,000 to be transferred  
14 from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

15 Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel:  
16 For expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel,  
17 \$350,000, together with not to exceed ~~\$20,000~~ \$25,000 to  
18 be transferred from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses,  
19 certification and inspection services", and not to exceed  
20 ~~\$355,000~~ \$375,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-  
21 age and survivors insurance trust fund.

22 Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for  
23 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k)  
24 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act  
25 of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal



1 excess property for educational purposes and protection of  
2 public health, ~~\$450,000~~ \$255,000.

3     *Working capital fund: The working capital fund estab-*  
4 *lished in the Federal Security Appropriations Act, 1953,*  
5 *shall hereafter be available for financing such control services*  
6 *as the Secretary determines may be performed more advanta-*  
7 *geously on a reimbursable basis.*

#### 8           REDUCTIONS IN CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

9     The contract authorization granted under the head  
10 “National Heart Institute”, in the Federal Security Agency  
11 Appropriation Act, 1950, is hereby reduced by the amount  
12 of \$3,124.

13     The contract authorization granted under the head “Con-  
14 struction of research facilities, Public Health Service” in  
15 title II of the Federal Security Appropriation Act of 1950  
16 is hereby reduced by the sum of \$800,000.

#### 17           REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

18     Amounts available from appropriations are hereby re-  
19 duced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be  
20 carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury  
21 immediately upon the approval of this Act, except as other-  
22 wise indicated:

23     “Grants to States, municipalities, etc., for plan prepara-  
24 tion, water pollution control”, \$200,000;

25     “Research facilities, National Institute of Dental

1 Research" Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1950,  
2 \$23,573.49;

3 "Payments to States for surveys and programs for hos-  
4 pital construction": The balance remaining unexpended on  
5 the date of approval of this Act;

6 "Grants for surveys and school construction": The bal-  
7 ance of the amount appropriated under section 101 of Public  
8 Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, second session (which sum  
9 was included under this head in chapter V of the Supple-  
10 mental Appropriation Act of 1951), which is unexpended  
11 on the date of approval of this Act *June 30, 1954*.

#### 12 GENERAL PROVISIONS

13 SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for  
14 salaries and expenses shall be available for examination of  
15 estimates of appropriations in the field, and for payment in  
16 advance for dues or fees for library membership in organiza-  
17 tions whose publications are available to members only or  
18 to members at a price lower than to the general public.

19 SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for  
20 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as au-  
21 thorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
22 U. S. C. 55a).

23 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for  
24 salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses  
25 and not to exceed ~~\$25,000~~ \$100,000 of such funds shall be



1 available for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned  
2 with the functions or activities for which such appropriations  
3 are made: *Provided, That hereafter appropriations to the*  
4 *Public Health Service for salaries and expenses shall be avail-*  
5 *able for reimbursement to commissioned officers of the Service*  
6 *for the use of taxicabs and other means of conveyance (includ-*  
7 *ing reimbursement for use of privately owned vehicles) within*  
8 *and around their designated posts of duty, such reimburse-*  
9 *ment to be on the same basis and subject to the same limitations*  
10 *as for civilian officers and employees, and subject to the*  
11 *approval of the Surgeon General or his authorized agent.*

12 SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated by this title  
13 to the Social Security Administration for grants in aid of  
14 State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of  
15 operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses  
16 of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld  
17 from the said agencies of any States which have established  
18 by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit  
19 system and classification and compensation plan covering  
20 the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their  
21 employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel  
22 or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said  
23 States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

24 SEC. 206. The Secretary is authorized to make such  
25 transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices,

1 without transfer of funds, as may be required in carrying  
2 out the operations of the Department.

3       *SEC. 207. In order to more effectively administer the*  
4 *programs and functions of the Department, the Secretary is*  
5 *authorized to transfer not to exceed  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per centum of any*  
6 *appropriation in this title available for salaries and expenses*  
7 *to any other such appropriation but no such appropriation*  
8 *shall be increased by more than  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per centum by any such*  
9 *transfer: Provided, That no such transfer shall be used for the*  
10 *creation of new functions within the Department.*

11       *SEC. 208. Terminal leave: On request of the Secretary*  
12 *of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the*  
13 *Treasury is authorized to transfer such amounts as may be*  
14 *necessary, but not to exceed a total of \$300,000, from un-*  
15 *obligated balances of appropriations for the Department of*  
16 *Health, Education, and Welfare, fiscal year 1953, to an*  
17 *appropriation account to be established for the payment of*  
18 *annual leave of employees separated from the service as a result*  
19 *of reductions of appropriations provided herein in excess of*  
20 *the average turn-over of employees in said Department over*  
21 *the period 1947-1952, to remain available until December*  
22 *31, 1953.*

23       This title may be cited as the "Department of Health,  
24 Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1954".



1 TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS  
2 BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses of attendance of meetings concerned with the work of the Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the General Counsel; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$9,000,-000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as defined in sections 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1060), and including in said definition employees engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on a mutual, non-profit basis and at least 95 per centum of the water stored or supplied thereby is used for farming purposes.

1 This title may be cited as the "National Labor Relations  
2 Board Appropriation Act, 1954".

3 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

4 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
5 National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting  
6 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
7 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$429,000.

8 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses neces-  
9 sary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of the  
10 Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157), and  
11 emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant to  
12 section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including steno-  
13 graphic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the  
14 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$138,000.

15 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

16 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
17 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic  
18 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
19 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$497,000, of which not  
20 less than ~~\$200,000~~ \$181,000 shall be available for compensa-  
21 tion (at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of  
22 referees appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor  
23 Act, as amended.



1        This title may be cited as the “National Mediation Board  
2    Appropriation Act, 1954”.

### 3        TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

4        Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust  
5    funds) : For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement  
6    Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of at-  
7    tendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board  
8    when specifically authorized by the Board; *purchase of one*  
9    *passenger motor vehicle, for replacement only*; and steno-  
10   graphic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the  
11   Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$6,207,000, to be  
12   derived from the railroad retirement account.

### 13                    REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

14        Payment to railroad retirement account: Appropria-  
15   tions granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951  
16   and prior fiscal years are hereby reduced by the sum of  
17   \$18,656,682, which shall be carried to the surplus of the  
18   Treasury.

19        This title may be cited as the “Railroad Retirement  
20   Board Appropriation Act, 1954”.

### 21                    TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND 22                    CONCILIATION SERVICE

23        Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
24   Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-  
25   Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171–180,

1 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel  
2 as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employ-  
3 ment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor  
4 relations at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses  
5 of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and indus-  
6 trial relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of  
7 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$3,200,000.

8       Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay  
9 necessary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the  
10 President pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management  
11 Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176–180, 182), including  
12 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,  
13 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rent in the District of Columbia,  
14 \$10,000.

15       This title may be cited as the “Federal Mediation and  
16 Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1954”.

## 17       TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

18       SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained  
19 in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of  
20 any person who engages in a strike against the Government  
21 of the United States or who is a member of an organization  
22 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike  
23 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-  
24 cates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the  
25 overthrow of the Government of the United States by force



1 or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affi-  
2 davit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the per-  
3 son making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions  
4 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government  
5 of the United States, is not a member of an organization of  
6 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against  
7 the Government of the United States, or that such person  
8 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization  
9 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the  
10 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That  
11 any person who engages in a strike against the Government  
12 of the United States or who is a member of an organization  
13 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike  
14 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-  
15 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,  
16 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by  
17 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or  
18 wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained  
19 in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction,  
20 shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not  
21 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the  
22 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in  
23 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

24 SEC. 702. No part of any appropriation contained in this

1 Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not  
2 authorized by the Congress.

3 SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this  
4 Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee  
5 engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that  
6 would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one  
7 hundred and five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and  
8 intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided,*  
9 That for purposes of this section employees shall be consid-  
10 ered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time  
11 or more in personnel administration consisting of direction  
12 and administration of the personnel program; employment,  
13 placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification;  
14 employee relations and services; training; committees of  
15 expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage  
16 administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

17 This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Labor and  
18 Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1954."

Passed the House of Representatives May 26, 1953.

Attest:

LYLE O. SNADER,

*Clerk.*



83d CONGRESS  
1st Session

H. R. 5246

[Report No. 478]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

MAY 27 (legislative day, MAY 21), 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JUNE 29 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1953

Reported with amendments







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 2, 1953  
For actions of July 1, 1953  
83rd-1st, No. 121

## CONTENTS

Appropriations.....7,11	Farm income.....20	Prices, cattle.....21
Cotton quotas.....16	Farm program.....9	Retirement.....6
Disaster relief.....3	Foreign aid.....1	School lunch.....21
Drought relief.....18	Labor, farm.....7	Social security.....8,14,19
Economic controls.....24	Lands, transfer.....4	Trade agreements.....2
Education.....7,12,17	Loans, drought.....15	Treaties.....22
Electrification.....23	Personnel.....6,13	Wheat imports.....5
Extension Service.....10		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed foreign aid bill. Senate debated trade agreements bill. Sen. Aiken and Rep. Hope introduced, and Sen. Aiken discussed, emergency-loans bill for farmers and stockmen.

## SENATE

1. FOREIGN AID. Passed with amendments H. R. 5710, to extend the Mutual Security Act (pp. 7995-8015, 8017-28). Senate conferees were appointed (p. 8028).  
Agreed to the following amendments:
  - By Sen. Thye, stating U. S. policy to encourage foreign free enterprise and labor unions and to discourage cartels (pp. 7996-8).
  - By Sen. Mansfield, providing that the mutual security program shall end June 30, 1955 (instead of 1956) and that appropriated funds, if obligated by that date, may remain available for 1 year thereafter (instead of 3 years thereafter)(pp. 7998-8000).
  - By Sen. McClellan, modified, by a 49-35 vote, providing that the President shall make available certain amounts for military assistance to eligible countries through currency conversion agreements involving purchase of U. S. agricultural commodities (pp. 8001-10, 8021-3).
  - By Sen. Saltonstall, providing that funds for mutual defense, if obligated before June 30, 1955, may remain available for 2 years thereafter (p. 8021).Rejected, 34-48, moves by Sen. Long to cut the authorization by \$2 billion, and also rejected, 38-42, an attempt by Sen. Long to reduce the amount to the House figure (pp. 8023-8).
2. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Began debate on H. R. 5495, to extend the reciprocal trade agreements program (pp. 8028-31).
3. DISASTER RELIEF. The Public Works Committee reported with amendments S. 2199, to allow State and local governments during major disasters to use or distribute certain surplus equipment and supplies of the Federal Government (S. Rept. 489) (p. 7980).



4. LAND TRANSFERS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 1400, to permit the Department to release the reversionary rights of the U. S. to a tract of rural-rehabilitation land in Wake County, N. C. (S. Rept. 490), and S. 2163, to authorize conveyance to N. C. of certain lands and improvements constituting the U. S. cotton field station at Statesville, N. C. (S. Rept. 491) (p. 7981).
5. WHEAT IMPORTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. Res. 127, to direct the Committee to investigate importation of wheat classified as unfit for human consumption and to report to the Senate by Jan. 31, 1954 (S. Rept. 492) (p. 7981). Referred to Rules and Administration Committee.
6. PERSONNEL. Sen. Carlson inserted a table showing countries in which alien U. S. employees are under the Civil Service Retirement Act (pp. 8020-1).
7. APPROPRIATIONS. In reporting the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1954 (see Digest 119), the Appropriations Committee concurred in the House figure of \$1,250,000 (\$350,000 under the revised estimate) for the Mexican farm labor program. It also concurred in the House action providing \$18,673,261, the original estimate, for vocational education. The Committee recommended a limitation on such education in the distributive occupations, and the committee report said this would prevent funds from being diverted from agriculture, home economics, etc.
8. SOCIAL SECURITY. Sen. Morse inserted an Oreg. Grange resolution favoring extension of the Social Security Act to farmers (p. 7980).
9. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Langer stated that N. Dak. farmers are discouraged at the drop in farm prices and inserted a constituent's letter favoring wheat acreage allotments instead of quotas and requesting 100% of parity (p. 7995).

#### HOUSE

10. EXTENSION SERVICE. A Judiciary subcommittee voted to report to the full Committee H. J. Res. 161, to authorize the President to designate 1953 as the 50th Anniversary Year of Farm Demonstration Work (p. D645).
11. APPROPRIATIONS. Began debate on H. R. 5969, the defense appropriation bill for 1954 (pp. 8036-88).
12. EDUCATION. The "Daily Digest" states the Education and Labor Committee "approved a clean bill for reporting...which would amend and extend Public Law 815 (81st Congress) relative to school construction in areas affected by Federal activities" (p. D645).
13. PERSONNEL. The Government Operations Committee submitted part 2 of its report on H. R. 5228, to provide retirement annuities for Comptroller Generals (p. 8092).

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

14. SOCIAL SECURITY. S. 2260, by Sen. Lehman (for himself and others), to amend the Social Security Act, including its extension to farmers; to Finance Committee (p. 7981). Remarks of author and text of bill (pp. 7981-90).
15. DROUGHT LOANS. S. 2267, by Sen. Aiken (for himself and others), to provide for additional emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen; to Agriculture and







7/7/53

-4-  
SENATE

to support the program of the A. F. of L. Government Employees' Council in Washington, D. C.; and opposing annual-leave legislation detrimental to Federal workers (pp. 8342, 8343).

22. HOLIDAY. Received an Ore. State Federation of Labor resolution favoring S. 805 making the first Tues. after the first Mon. in Nov. in every even-numbered year a legal holiday (pp. 8342-3).

23. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 5246, the Labor-HHW appropriation bill for 1954 (pp. 8355-404). Sens. Thye, Knowland, Bridges, Young, Chavez, Russell, and Hill were appointed as conferees (p. 8404).

Agreed to the following amendments:

By the committee, all its amendments (some with amendments as indicated below) (pp. 8355-7).

By Sen. Morse, to a committee amendment, increasing by \$200,000 funds for the Food and Drug Administration (p. 8369).

By Sen. Thye, increasing by \$426,000 funds for the Office of Education (pp. 8369-70).

By Sen. Aiken, increasing by \$170,000 funds for the Mexican farm-labor program (pp. 8395-7).

By Sen. Potter, increasing by \$1,150,000 funds for Office of Vocational Rehabilitation (pp. 8374-7).

By Sen. Hayden, to a committee amendment, increasing by \$210,000 funds for the Bureau of Employment Security (pp. 8359-60).

24. CONSUMER INTERESTS. Sen. Gillette inserted his statement explaining seven resolutions he introduced recently, S. Res. 128 through 134, which would provide for investigations by 7 different standing committees of the effect of major legislation upon ultimate consumer interests (pp. 8351-2).

25. PERSONNEL ALLOWANCES. Sec. 640 of H. R. 5969, the defense appropriation bill for 1954, provides as follows: "No part of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act shall be available for the payment to any United States citizen resident in one of its Territories or possessions, of any station, subsistence, quarters, or other foreign duty allowances over and above the authorized pay and allowances for comparable grade or rating in the continental United States unless such person is serving outside the Territory or possession in which he is resident."

BILLS INTRODUCED

26. WATER CONSERVATION. H. R. 6112, by Rep. Curtis, Neb., to facilitate the development and construction of water conservation facilities by States and municipalities; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 8338).

27. DISASTER RELIEF. H. R. 6129, by Rep. Philbin, creating a Government-owned corporation to insure against certain disasters; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 8339).

H. R. 6139, by Rep. McCormack, to allow States during major disasters to use or distribute certain surplus equipment and supplies of the Federal Government; to Public Works Committee (p. 8339).

28. GRAIN STORAGE. H. R. 6137, by Rep. Martin, Ia., and H. R. 6138, by Rep. Curtis, Neb., to provide tax incentive for the creation of additional grain storage facilities; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 8339).



SENATE

12. DROUGHT RELIEF. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) with amendments S. 2267, to provide emergency aid to farmers and stockmen in the drought areas. The "Daily Digest" states, "The principal amendment approved would strike out emergency assistance in furnishing feed and seed, as provided in the bill, on the basis that such assistance may be given under Public Law 875 of the 81st Congress" (p. D662).
13. WHEAT MARKETING QUOTAS. An Agriculture and Forestry Subcommittee ordered reported to the full committee S. 2099, to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (p. D662).
14. FOREIGN AID. Senator Humphrey urged the conferees on the foreign aid bill to find "a means of utilizing the surplus agricultural commodities and the abundance of American farm production," and inserted a Washington Evening Star editorial on this subject (pp. 8406-8).
15. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Sen. Johnson, Tex., was excused from further service as a member of the Government Operations Committee; and Sen. McClellan was assigned to the Judiciary Committee "to fill an existing vacancy thereon" (p. 8340).
16. TREATIES. Received a certified copy of an International Convention To Facilitate Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material, and the State Department Secretary's report thereon (Exec. Q. 83rd Cong.); to Foreign Relations Committee (p. 8408).
17. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) without amendment S. 281, to extend power to the ICC to authorize discontinuance of certain intrastate railroad services; and with amendments S. 539, to authorize the ICC to make mandatory the installation of certain railroad communications systems, and H. R. 2236, to establish a Commission on Area Problems of the Greater Washington Metropolitan Area (p. D663).
18. FOREIGN TRADE. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) an original concurrent resolution, in lieu of S. 1962, expressing the sense of Congress that export containers be marked with the words "United States of America" (p. D663).
19. ELECTRIFICATION. Received resolutions from the American Public Power Ass'n. and the Ore. State Federation of Labor favoring redevelopment of Niagara Falls power by "appropriate public agencies"; and construction of the Hells Canyon dam, respectively (pp. 8341, 8342).
20. NATURAL RESOURCES; FORESTRY. Received Ore. State Federation of Labor resolution commending "Sen. Morse and his colleagues in their efforts to safeguard and develop our natural resources...for all the people..."; and favoring a deduction of \$200 yearly for income tax purposes for fire fighters for dual food expense while fighting fires (p. 8342).
21. PERSONNEL. Received Ore. State Federation of Labor resolutions opposing legislative riders to appropriation bills which injure the rights and privileges of Federal employees; favoring a salary increase for Federal employees; urging Congress

83D CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 5246

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 7, 1953

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

1      *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2      *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3      That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4      in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-  
5      ments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and  
6      related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June  
7      30, 1954, namely:



## TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; teletype news service; any payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; ~~(1)\$1,250,000~~ \$1,448,000.

## OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, ~~(2)\$1,350,000~~ \$1,600,000: ~~(3)Provided, That the compensation of the Solicitor shall be \$14,800 per annum~~ *Provided, That hereafter the compensation of the Solicitor shall be at a rate equal to the rate established by law for grade GS-18.*

## BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; performance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 784 (c) ) ; performance of the functions vested in

the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g) ) ; and not to exceed \$70,000 for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as authorized by the Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409) , including purchase of reports and of material for informational exhibits **(4)***and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards; (5)*~~\$624,000~~ \$800,000.

#### BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to render assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment rights under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 308) , the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as amended, and section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and, under the Act of June 23, 1943, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1472) , of persons who have performed service in the Merchant Marine, \$300,000.

#### BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging apprentice training, as authorized by the Act of August 16, 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50) , **(6)**~~\$3,400,000~~ \$3,230,000.



## 1 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

2 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
3 general administration of the employment service and un-  
4 employment compensation programs, including temporary  
5 employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service  
6 laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program;  
7 and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by sec-  
8 tion 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ;  
9 ~~(7)\$5,100,000~~ \$5,435,000, of which ~~(8)\$981,000~~ \$1,-  
10 100,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of  
11 title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjust-  
12 ment Act of 1944.

13 Grants to States for unemployment compensation and  
14 employment service administration: For grants in accord-  
15 ance with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as  
16 amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect  
17 section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944,  
18 for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the  
19 Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503),  
20 including, upon the request of any State, the purchase of  
21 equipment and the payment of rental for space made avail-  
22 able to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, for  
23 necessary expenses in connection with the operation of em-  
24 ployment office facilities and services in the District of  
25 Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for,

1 necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjust-  
2 ment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684), ~~(9)\$187,300,-~~  
3 ~~000 \$197,110,000~~, of which ~~(10)\$10,000,000~~ \$5,000,000  
4 shall be available only to the extent that the Secretary finds  
5 necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting  
6 from changes in a State law or increases in the numbers  
7 of claims filed and claims paid ~~(11)~~*or salary costs* over  
8 those upon which the State's basic grant (or the allocation  
9 for the District of Columbia) was based, which increased  
10 costs of administration cannot be provided for by normal  
11 budgetary adjustments: *Provided*, That notwithstanding  
12 any provision to the contrary in section 302 (a) of the  
13 Social Security Act, as amended, the Secretary of Labor  
14 shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the  
15 Treasury for payment to each State found to be in com-  
16 pliance with the requirements of the Act of June 6, 1933,  
17 and, except in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin  
18 Islands; with the provisions of section 303 of the Social  
19 Security Act, as amended, such amounts as he determines  
20 to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration  
21 of its unemployment compensation law and of its public  
22 employment offices: *Provided further*, That such amounts  
23 as may be agreed upon by the Department of Labor  
24 and the Post Office Department shall be used for the pay-  
25 ment, in such manner as said parties may jointly determine,



1 of postage for the transmission of official mail matter in con-  
2 nection with the administration of unemployment compensa-  
3 tion systems and employment services by States receiving  
4 grants herefrom.

5 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,  
6 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social  
7 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and  
8 maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall  
9 apply.

10 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the  
11 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State  
12 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation  
13 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of offi-  
14 cers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from  
15 the said agencies of any States which have established by  
16 legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system  
17 and classification and compensation plan covering the selec-  
18 tion, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees,  
19 because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner  
20 of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the  
21 rates of pay of said officers or employees.

22 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-  
23 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to  
24 States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended,  
25 and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first

1 quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may  
 2 be necessary. the obligations incurred and the expenditures  
 3 made thereunder for payments under such title and under  
 4 such Act of June 6, 1933. to be charged to the appropriation  
 5 therefor for that fiscal year.

6 Unemployment compensation for veterans: For pay-  
 7 ments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV  
 8 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952,  
 9 ~~(12)\$41,000,000~~ \$38,500,000.

10 Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program: For  
 11 expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out  
 12 the functions of the Department of Labor under the Act of  
 13 July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78), including temporary em-  
 14 ployment of persons without regard to the civil service laws,  
 15 ~~(13)\$1,250,000~~ \$1,420,000.

16 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

17 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative  
 18 expenses and not to exceed \$87,000 for the Employees'  
 19 Compensation Appeals Board, \$2,000,000, together with  
 20 not to exceed \$90,000 to be derived from the War Claims  
 21 Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of  
 22 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

23 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of  
 24 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except ad-  
 25 ministrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing dur-



1 ing the current or any prior fiscal year, including payments  
2 to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital services  
3 pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of Em-  
4 ployees' Compensation; continuation of payment of bene-  
5 fits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits"  
6 in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947;  
7 the advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in  
8 third-party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital  
9 services and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial ex-  
10 penses, including transportation and other expenses in-  
11 cidental to such services, treatment, and burial, for such  
12 enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified  
13 by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital services  
14 and treatment at Government expense on June 30, 1943,  
15 and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian em-  
16 ployees of the United States, and the limitations and  
17 authority of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended  
18 (5 U. S. C. 796), shall apply in providing such services,  
19 treatment, and expenses in such cases; such amount as  
20 may be required during the current fiscal year: *Provided,*  
21 That this appropriation shall be available for payments pur-  
22 suant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of the War Claims Act  
23 of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012) and shall be credited with  
24 advances or reimbursements therefor from the War Claims

1 Fund created by section 13 (a) of said War Claims Act of  
2 1948.

3 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

4 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
5 work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement  
6 to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for  
7 services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for services  
8 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
9 (5 U. S. C. 55a), ~~(14)\$5,250,000~~ \$5,345,000.

10 WOMEN'S BUREAU

11 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
12 work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of  
13 June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of  
14 reports and material for informational exhibits, ~~(15)\$360,-~~  
15 ~~000~~ \$350,000.

16 WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

17 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for per-  
18 forming the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act  
19 of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions for  
20 the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the  
21 United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41  
22 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State  
23 Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspec-



1 tion services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for expenses  
 2 of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at con-  
 3 ferences concerned with the work of the Division, ~~(16)~~\$6,-  
 4 ~~000,000~~ \$6,250,000.

#### 5 GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for  
 7 salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic  
 8 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
 9 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), for examination of esti-  
 10 mates of appropriations in the field, and for expenses of  
 11 attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activ-  
 12 ity for which any such appropriation is made.

13 ~~(17)~~SEC. 103. *Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appro-*  
 14 *priation in this title may be transferred to any other such*  
 15 *appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased*  
 16 *by more than 5 per centum by any such transfer: Provided,*  
 17 *That no such transfer shall be used for creation of new func-*  
 18 *tions within the Department.*

19 ~~(18)~~SEC. 104. *Terminal leave: On request of the Secretary*  
 20 *of Labor, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to*  
 21 *transfer such amounts as may be necessary, but not to exceed*  
 22 *\$300,000, from unobligated balances of appropriations for*  
 23 *the Department of Labor, fiscal year 1953, to an appropria-*  
 24 *tion account to be established for the payment of annual leave*  
 25 *of employees separated from the service as a result of reduc-*

tions of appropriations provided herein in excess of the average turn-over of employees in said Department over the period 1947-1952, to remain available until December 31, 1953.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1954".

## TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

### AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), \$175,000.

### COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Columbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improvements, \$410,000: *Provided*, That the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, shall be paid by the District of Columbia, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, at the rate of \$1,150 per school year for each student attending said Institution pursuant to the Act of March 1, 1901 (31 D. C. Code 1008).

**(19)** *For an additional amount for the construction of buildings to accommodate deaf children at the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, \$41,000.*



## 1                   FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

2           Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for car-  
3 rying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as  
4 amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392) ; the Tea Importation Act,  
5 as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50) ; the Import Milk Act  
6 (21 U. S. C. 141-149) ; the Federal Caustic Poison Act  
7 (15 U. S. C. 401-411) ; and the Filled Milk Act, as  
8 amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64) ; reporting and illustrating  
9 the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, appa-  
10 ratus, and scientific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for  
11 payment in advance for special test and analyses by contract;  
12 and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection with  
13 studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug  
14 enforcement operations; **(20)**~~\$5,000,000~~ \$5,400,000.

15          Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection serv-  
16 ices: For expenses necessary for the certification or in-  
17 spection of certain products in accordance with sections  
18 406, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food,  
19 Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346,  
20 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of  
21 the advance deposits during the current fiscal year to cover  
22 payment of fees by applicants for certification or inspection  
23 of such products, to remain available until expended. The  
24 total amount herein appropriated shall be available for  
25 personal services; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and

1 scientific equipment; and the refund of advance deposits  
2 for which no service has been rendered.

3 FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

4 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for opera-  
5 tion and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repair-  
6 ing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in  
7 the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to  
8 the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard Univer-  
9 sity" for salaries of technical and professional personnel de-  
10 tailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of  
11 Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and power  
12 furnished by such university; \$3,104,000: *Provided*, That  
13 no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from  
14 this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compen-  
15 sation in the form of wages or salary from any other appro-  
16 priation in this title: *Provided further*, That the District of  
17 Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon  
18 the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning  
19 of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General cal-  
20 culates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the  
21 Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the  
22 District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon Gen-  
23 eral on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to  
24 audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper  
25 adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on



1 the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of  
 2 each quarter: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General  
 3 may delegate the responsibilities imposed upon him by the  
 4 foregoing proviso.

#### 5 HOWARD UNIVERSITY

6 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of How-  
 7 ard University, including personal services and miscellaneous  
 8 expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds, \$2,535,000.

9 Construction of buildings: ~~(21) For the purchase and in-~~  
 10 ~~stallation of a vacuum pump in the steam system, \$20,000~~  
 11 *For the alteration and improvement of power plant facilities,*  
 12 *including engineering and architectural services, \$170,000.*

#### 13 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

14 Promotion and further development of vocational edu-  
 15 cation: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the  
 16 Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15), section  
 17 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), section  
 18 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30), and the  
 19 Act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462), \$18,673,261:  
 20 *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States under the  
 21 Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed on the  
 22 basis of not to exceed \$18,498,261 for the current fiscal  
 23 year **(22)**: *Provided further*, *That not more than \$450,000*  
 24 *of this appropriation shall be available for vocational educa-*  
 25 *tion in distributive occupations.*

1 Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the  
 2 mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section  
 3 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended, \$2,501,500.

4 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
 5 Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investiga-  
 6 tions, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination  
 7 of public and school library service; coordination of library  
 8 service on the national level with other forms of adult educa-  
 9 tion; developing library participation in Federal projects;  
 10 fostering Nation-wide coordination of research materials  
 11 among libraries, interstate library coordination and the de-  
 12 velopment of library service throughout the country; pur-  
 13 chase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents,  
 14 motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, ex-  
 15 change, and cataloging of educational apparatus and ap-  
 16 pliances, articles of school furniture and models of school  
 17 buildings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and  
 18 methods of education, and repairing the same; ~~(23)\$2,500,~~  
 19 ~~000~~ \$2,926,000 (24), of which not less than \$480,000 shall  
 20 be available for the Division of Vocational Education as au-  
 21 thorized: Provided, That all receipts from non-Federal agen-  
 22 cies representing reimbursement for expenses of travel of  
 23 employees of the Office of Education performing advisory  
 24 functions to the said agencies shall be deposited in the



1 Treasury of the United States to the credit of this  
2 appropriation.

3       Payments to school districts: For payments to local edu-  
4 cational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools  
5 as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public  
6 Law 874), \$66,500,000: *Provided*, That this appropria-  
7 tion shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of  
8 section 6 of such Act (25): *Provided further*, That for the  
9 fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and for each succeeding  
10 fiscal year, all land lying within the boundaries of the Boulder  
11 Canyon Project Reservation shall be considered Federal prop-  
12 erty within the meaning of Public Law 874, Eighty-first  
13 Congress, second session; but this proviso shall not be con-  
14 strued as to interfere with State taxation of leasehold interests:  
15 *Provided further*, That any tax collected for school purposes  
16 on any leasehold interest within the boundaries of the Boulder  
17 City Union School District on and after July 1, 1953, shall  
18 be deducted under section 3 (g) of said Act.

19 (26) School construction: The amount made available under  
20 this head in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1953,  
21 for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other  
22 agencies is increased from “\$750,000” to “\$1,250,000”.

23                   OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

24       Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and  
25 Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska,

1 Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Voca-  
 2 tional Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4),  
 3 including payments, in accordance with regulations of the  
 4 Secretary, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the  
 5 acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accord-  
 6 ance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for the use of  
 7 blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be con-  
 8 trolled by the State agency, \$23,000,000, of which not to  
 9 exceed ~~(27)\$175,000~~ \$195,000 shall be available to the  
 10 Secretary for providing rehabilitation services to disabled  
 11 residents of the District of Columbia, as authorized by sec-  
 12 tion 6 of said Act, which latter amount shall be available  
 13 for administrative expenses in connection with providing  
 14 such services in the District of Columbia: *Provided, That*  
 15 *not to exceed 15 per centum of the appropriation shall be*  
 16 *used for administrative purposes (28):* *Provided further, That*  
 17 *after payment of amounts certified to be due for prior fiscal*  
 18 *years, the funds herein appropriated shall be apportioned*  
 19 *among the States in accordance with regulations promulgated*  
 20 *by the Secretary to insure equitable maintenance and improve-*  
 21 *ment of State programs; and the obligation of the United*  
 22 *States to any State under such Act for fiscal year 1954 shall*  
 23 *not exceed the amount so apportioned to such State.*

24 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and



1 Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making,  
 2 after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States  
 3 in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as  
 4 amended (including the objects specified in the preceding  
 5 paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding  
 6 fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations  
 7 incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be  
 8 charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year:  
 9 *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this para-  
 10 graph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the  
 11 first quarter of the current fiscal year.

12 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in car-  
 13 rying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,  
 14 as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20  
 15 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including not to exceed \$3,000 for pro-  
 16 duction, purchase, and distribution of educational films;  
 17 ~~(29)\$690,000~~ \$655,500.

#### 18 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

19 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public Health  
 20 Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) (hereinafter  
 21 referred to as the Act), and other Acts, including expenses  
 22 for active commissioned officers in the Reserve Corps and  
 23 for not to exceed one thousand five hundred commissioned  
 24 officers in the Regular Corps; as follows:

25 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sec-

1 tions 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal  
 2 diseases including the operation and maintenance of centers  
 3 for the diagnosis and treatment of persons afflicted with  
 4 venereal diseases; and for grants of money, services, sup-  
 5 plies, equipment, and use of facilities to States, as defined  
 6 in the Act, and with the approval of the respective State  
 7 health authorities, to counties, health districts, and other  
 8 political subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes,  
 9 in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the  
 10 Surgeon General may determine; \$5,000,000.

11 Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314  
 12 (b) of the Act, ~~(30)\$5,725,000~~ \$7,025,000.

13 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes,  
 14 not otherwise specifically provided for, of section 314 (c) of  
 15 the Act; to provide consultative services to States pursuant  
 16 to section 311 of the Act; to make field investigations and  
 17 demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the Act; and to  
 18 provide for collecting and compiling mortality, morbidity,  
 19 and vital statistics; \$13,250,000 ~~(31)~~, *of which not more than*  
 20 *\$2,400,000 shall be available for personal services.*

21 Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as other-  
 22 wise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311,  
 23 and 361 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppres-  
 24 sion of communicable and preventable diseases, and the inter-  
 25 state transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase,



1 erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; and hire,  
 2 maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$5,000,000 (32), of  
 3 which not less than \$400,000 shall be used for studies, preven-  
 4 tion, and control activities on poliomyelitis.

5       Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For  
 6 expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out  
 7 those provisions of sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of  
 8 the Act relating to sanitation and other aspects of environ-  
 9 mental health, including enforcement of applicable quaran-  
 10 tine laws and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carry-  
 11 ing out the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act  
 12 (33 U. S. C. 466-466 (j)) ; (33)\$3,000,000 \$3,325,000.

13       Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Ter-  
 14 ritory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct,  
 15 in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Terri-  
 16 tory of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the  
 17 investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases,  
 18 and the establishment and maintenance of health and sani-  
 19 tation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in  
 20 sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of  
 21 subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set  
 22 forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361 and 363 of the  
 23 Act, including the hire, operation, and maintenance of air-  
 24 craft, and the purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable  
 25 buildings, \$1,082,000.

1 Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hos-  
 2 pital construction under part C, title VI, of the Act, as  
 3 amended, to remain available until expended, ~~(34)\$50,000,-~~  
 4 ~~000 \$75,000,000~~: *Provided*, That allotments under such part  
 5 C to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made  
 6 on the basis of an amount equal to the appropriation granted  
 7 herein.

8 Grants for hospital construction (liquidation of contract  
 9 authorization) : For payment of obligations incurred under  
 10 authority heretofore granted under this head, \$19,700,000.

11 Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:  
 12 For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI  
 13 of the Act, as amended, ~~(35)\$750,000~~ \$1,000,000.

14 Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the func-  
 15 tions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August 8,  
 16 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), and under sections 321, 322, 324,  
 17 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the  
 18 Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079  
 19 of February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of  
 20 farm products and livestock; conducting research on tech-  
 21 nical nursing standards and furnishing consultative nursing  
 22 services; and purchase of firearms and ammunition;  
 23 ~~(36)\$32,500,000~~ \$33,500,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall  
 24 be exclusively available for payments to the Territory of



1 Hawaii for care and treatment of persons afflicted with  
2 leprosy: *Provided*, That when the Public Health Service  
3 establishes or operates a health service program for any  
4 department or agency, payment for the estimated cost shall  
5 be made in advance for deposit to the credit of this appro-  
6 priation.

7 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-  
8 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to preventing  
9 the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign coun-  
10 tries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance with  
11 section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of  
12 quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the Act  
13 in private or other public hospitals when facilities of the  
14 Public Health Service are not available, including insurance  
15 of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required  
16 by law of such countries; \$2,900,000.

17 National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For  
18 the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not other-  
19 wise provided for, including research fellowships and grants  
20 for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act;  
21 not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visiting scientists  
22 when specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection  
23 of temporary structures; and grants of therapeutic and  
24 chemical substances for demonstrations and research; \$4,675,-  
25 000; *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to

1 advance to this appropriation from other appropriations to  
 2 the Public Health Service such amounts as are determined  
 3 to be necessary for the foregoing purposes and for activities  
 4 performed on a centralized basis: *Provided further*, That the  
 5 Surgeon General is authorized to operate facilities at the  
 6 National Institutes of Health for the sale of meals to em-  
 7 ployees and others **(37)**and the proceeds thereof may be  
 8 credited to this appropriation at rates determined by him to  
 9 be sufficient to recover the cost of such operation and the  
 10 proceeds thereof shall be credited to this appropriation.

11 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon Gen-  
 12 eral, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory  
 13 Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and train-  
 14 ing projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State  
 15 health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit in-  
 16 stitutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of can-  
 17 cer by providing consultative services, demonstrations, and  
 18 grants-in-aid; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of  
 19 title IV, part A, of the Act; **(38)**~~\$17,887,000~~ \$20,487,000.

20 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for  
 21 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311,  
 22 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases,  
 23 **(39)**~~\$10,895,000~~ \$12,345,000.

24 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to



1 carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act,  
 2 ~~(40)\$12,000,000~~ \$15,418,000.

3 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise  
 4 provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to  
 5 carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental  
 6 diseases and conditions, ~~(41)\$1,650,000~~ \$1,740,000.

7 Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: For expenses  
 8 necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to  
 9 arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, ~~(42)\$5,000,~~  
 10 ~~000~~ \$7,000,000.

11 Microbiology activities: For expenses necessary to carry  
 12 out the purposes of the Act relating to microbiology, includ-  
 13 ing the regulation and preparation of biologic products,  
 14 ~~(43)\$5,479,200~~ \$5,738,000.

15 Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses neces-  
 16 sary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to neurology  
 17 and blindness, ~~(44)\$4,000,000~~ \$4,750,000.

18 Construction of research facilities (liquidation of contract  
 19 authorization): For payment of obligations incurred pur-  
 20 suant to authority granted to enter into contracts for con-  
 21 struction of a combined hospital and research building as  
 22 authorized in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation  
 23 Acts of 1949 and 1950, to be transferred to the General  
 24 Services Administration, \$2,500,000.

25 Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay

1 of commissioned officers, as authorized by law, \$1,197,000, to  
2 remain available until expended: *Provided*, That hereafter  
3 a commissioned officer of the Public Health Service who has  
4 been retired may be recalled to active duty, other than in  
5 time of war, with his consent.

6 Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of  
7 the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous  
8 expenses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for  
9 elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and pub-  
10 lications related to public health; conducting studies and  
11 demonstrations in public health methods; and carrying on  
12 international health activities, including not to exceed \$1,000  
13 for entertainment of officials of other countries when specifi-  
14 cally authorized by the Surgeon General; \$2,900,000.

15 Service and supply fund: For additional working capital  
16 for the "Service and supply fund," created by title II of the  
17 Act of July 3, 1945 (42 U. S. C. 321), not to exceed \$200,-  
18 000, to be derived by transfer from such ~~(45)~~ other funds  
19 appropriated in this Act to the National Institutes of Health  
20 as the Surgeon General may determine, to remain available  
21 until expended: *Provided*, That any stocks of supplies and  
22 equipment of the Public Health Service related to services  
23 financed under this fund may also be used to capitalize said  
24 ~~fund~~ unobligated balances of 1953 appropriations of the  
25 National Institutes of Health as the Surgeon General may



1 *determine, to be available without fiscal year limitation: Pro-*  
2 *vided, That supplies, materials, stocks, and equipment here-*  
3 *tofore or hereafter derived by transfers to this fund may also*  
4 *be used to capitalize said fund: Provided further, That such*  
5 *funds may be reimbursed in advance from available funds of*  
6 *organizations covering estimated or actual charges for serv-*  
7 *ices, supplies, and materials furnished and operating expenses,*  
8 *including reserves for accrued annual leave.*

9       Administrative provisions: During the current fiscal  
10 year, and with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,  
11 there may be transferred from any annual appropriation to  
12 the Public Health Service to any other such appropriation  
13 such additional amounts as may be required for pay and  
14 allowances of the active commissioned officers herein au-  
15 thorized, but any amounts so transferred shall not exceed  
16 5 per centum of any such appropriation and no such appro-  
17 priation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum as a  
18 result of any such transfers.

19                               SAINT ELIZABETH'S HOSPITAL

20       Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
21 maintenance and operation of the hospital, including pur-  
22 chase of clothing for patients and cooperation with organ-  
23 izations or individuals in scientific research into the nature,  
24 causes, prevention and treatment of mental illness,  
25 \$2,417,000.

Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds:

For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including preparation of plans and specifications, advertising, and supervision of construction, \$399,500: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be transferred to the General Services Administration.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors

Insurance: For necessary expenses, including furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equipment used by building guards; not more than \$62,750,000 may be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: For ~~(46)~~beginning preparing for construction of an office building and appurtenant facilities for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, including equipment, acquisition of land (including donations thereof), and preparation of plans and specifications, \$1,500,000, to be derived from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and to remain available until expended ~~(47)~~:~~Provided~~, That appropriations for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to the General Services Administration, but the selection of the site and the building plans shall be subject to approval by the



1 Secretary: *Provided further*, That the total cost of the project  
 2 herein authorized shall not exceed \$27,000,000, but this  
 3 limitation may be exceeded, or shall be reduced, by an amount  
 4 equal to the percentage increase or decrease, if any, in con-  
 5 struction costs generally dating from January 1, 1953, as  
 6 determined by the Administrator of General Services.

7 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to  
 8 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid  
 9 to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled,  
 10 as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social  
 11 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV,  
 12 X, and XIV), \$1,340,000,000, of which such amount as  
 13 may be necessary shall be available for grants for any period  
 14 in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year.

15 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance:  
 16 For expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance,  
 17 ~~(48)\$1,600,000~~ \$1,550,000.

18 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary  
 19 expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as  
 20 amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6), and title V of the Social  
 21 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),  
 22 including purchase of reports and material for the publica-  
 23 tions of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution,  
 24 ~~(49)\$1,500,000~~ \$1,550,000: *Provided*, That no part of any  
 25 appropriation contained in this title shall be used to promul-

1 gate or carry out any instructions, order, or regulation  
 2 relating to the care of obstetrical cases which discriminate  
 3 between persons licensed under State law to practice obstet-  
 4 rics: *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not  
 5 be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the  
 6 services of any practitioner of her own choice, paid for out  
 7 of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with: *Pro-*  
 8 *vided further*, That any State plan which provides standards  
 9 for professional obstetrical services in accordance with the  
 10 laws of the State shall be approved.

11 Grants to States for material and child welfare: For  
 12 grants to States for maternal and child-health services, serv-  
 13 ices for crippled children, and child-welfare services as au-  
 14 thorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security  
 15 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),  
 16 \$30,000,000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pur-  
 17 suant to section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not  
 18 be included in computing for the purposes of subsections (a)  
 19 and (b) of sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount  
 20 expended or estimated to be expended by the State (50): *Pro-*  
 21 *vided further*, That, in computing allotments to States under  
 22 sections 502, 512, and 521 (a) of such Act for the current  
 23 fiscal year, balances in allotments previously made to States  
 24 which remain available in the Federal Treasury for payment  
 25 to them as of July 1, 1953, shall be taken into account by



1    *(1) adding the total of such balances to the appropriation*  
2    *herein made, and (2) subtracting from each resulting allot-*  
3    *ment to any State under section 502 (a), 512 (a), or 521*  
4    *(a) any balance in any prior allotment under such section*  
5    *which remains available in the Federal Treasury for pay-*  
6    *ment to it as of such date but with such adjustments as may*  
7    *be necessary to assure that this proviso does not operate to*  
8    *deprive any State of any balance in an allotment previously*  
9    *made to it under such section.*

10        Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For  
11    expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner for  
12    Social Security, \$173,000, together with not to exceed  
13    \$123,500 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and  
14    survivors insurance trust fund.

15        Operating fund, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions: For  
16    additional working capital for the fund established by section  
17    5 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U. S. C. 1755),  
18    \$250,000, to be available for the purposes of such fund  
19    without fiscal year limitation: *Provided*, That this amount  
20    shall be treated as a loan to such fund and shall bear interest,  
21    payable annually, at a rate determined by the Secretary of  
22    the Treasury after taking into consideration the average rate  
23    of interest payable upon all marketable interest-bearing obli-  
24    gations of the United States: *Provided further*, That begin-  
25    ning not later than July 1, 1955, such amount shall be paid

1 from such fund into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts  
 2 at an annual rate of not less than one-tenth of such amount.

3 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-  
 4 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to  
 5 States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respectively, of  
 6 the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter  
 7 of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be neces-  
 8 sary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made  
 9 thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be  
 10 charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

11 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, re-  
 12 spectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, payments  
 13 to a State under any of such titles for any quarter in the  
 14 period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending June  
 15 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to a State  
 16 plan approved under such title prior to or during such period,  
 17 but no such payment shall be made with respect to any  
 18 plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which such plan  
 19 was submitted for approval.

20 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

21 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For ex-  
 22 penses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, ~~(51)\$1,075,-~~  
 23 ~~000 \$1,226,000~~, together with not to exceed ~~(52)\$168,000~~  
 24 \$175,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and  
 25 survivors insurance trust fund.



1 Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services: For  
 2 expenses necessary for the Office of Field Services, \$1,835,-  
 3 000, together with not to exceed \$375,000 to be transferred  
 4 from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

5 Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel:  
 6 For expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel,  
 7 \$350,000, together with not to exceed ~~(53)\$20,000~~ \$25,000  
 8 to be transferred from the appropriation "Salaries and ex-  
 9 penses, certification and inspection services", and not to  
 10 exceed ~~(54)\$355,000~~ \$375,000 to be transferred from the  
 11 Federal old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund.

12 Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for  
 13 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k)  
 14 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act  
 15 of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal  
 16 excess property for educational purposes and protection of  
 17 public health, ~~(55)\$450,000~~ \$255,000.

18 ~~(56)~~*Working capital fund: The working capital fund estab-*  
 19 *lished in the Federal Security Appropriations Act, 1953,*  
 20 *shall hereafter be available for financing such central services*  
 21 *as the Secretary determines may be performed more advanta-*  
 22 *geously on a reimbursable basis.*

## 23 REDUCTIONS IN CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

24 The contract authorization granted under the head  
 25 "National Heart Institute", in the Federal Security Agency

1 Appropriation Act, 1950, is hereby reduced by the amount  
2 of \$3,124.

3 The contract authorization granted under the head "Con-  
4 struction of research facilities, Public Health Service" in  
5 title II of the Federal Security Appropriation Act of 1950  
6 is hereby reduced by the sum of \$800,000.

7 REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

8 Amounts available from appropriations are hereby re-  
9 duced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be  
10 carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury  
11 immediately upon the approval of this Act, except as other-  
12 wise indicated:

13 "Grants to States, municipalities, etc., for plan prepara-  
14 tion, water pollution control", \$200,000;

15 "Research facilities, National Institute of Dental  
16 Research" Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1950,  
17 \$23,573.49;

18 "Payments to States for surveys and programs for hos-  
19 pital construction": The balance remaining unexpended on  
20 the date of approval of this Act;

21 "Grants for surveys and school construction": The bal-  
22 ance of the amount appropriated under section 101 of Public  
23 Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, second session (which sum  
24 was included under this head in chapter V of the Supple-



1 mental Appropriation Act of 1951), which is unexpended  
 2 on ~~(57)~~the date of approval of this Act *June 30, 1954.*

### 3 GENERAL PROVISIONS

4 SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for  
 5 salaries and expenses shall be available for examination of  
 6 estimates of appropriations in the field, and for payment in  
 7 advance for dues or fees for library membership in organiza-  
 8 tions whose publications are available to members only or  
 9 to members at a price lower than to the general public.

10 SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for  
 11 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as au-  
 12 thorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
 13 U. S. C. 55a).

14 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for  
 15 salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses  
 16 and not to exceed ~~(58)\$25,000~~ \$100,000 of such funds shall  
 17 be available for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned  
 18 with the functions or activities for which such appropriations  
 19 are made ~~(59)~~: *Provided, That hereafter appropriations to the*  
 20 *Public Health Service for salaries and expenses shall be avail-*  
 21 *able for reimbursement to commissioned officers of the Service*  
 22 *for the use of taxicabs and other means of conveyance (includ-*  
 23 *ing reimbursement for use of privately owned vehicles) within*  
 24 *and around their designated posts of duty, such reimburse-*  
 25 *ment to be on the same basis and subject to the same limitations*

1 *as for civilian officers and employees, and subject to the*  
2 *approval of the Surgeon General or his authorized agent.*

3       SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated by this title  
4 to the Social Security Administration for grants in aid of  
5 State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of  
6 operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses  
7 of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld  
8 from the said agencies of any States which have established  
9 by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit  
10 system and classification and compensation plan covering  
11 the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their  
12 employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel  
13 or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said  
14 States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

15       SEC. 206. The Secretary is authorized to make such  
16 transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices,  
17 without transfer of funds, as may be required in carrying  
18 out the operations of the Department.

19 ~~(60)~~SEC. 207. *In order to more effectively administer the*  
20 *programs and functions of the Department, the Secretary is*  
21 *authorized to transfer not to exceed 2½ per centum of any*  
22 *appropriation in this title available for salaries and expenses*  
23 *to any other such appropriation but no such appropriation*  
24 *shall be increased by more than 2½ per centum by any such*



1 *transfer: Provided, That no such transfer shall be used for the*  
 2 *creation of new functions within the Department.*

3 **(61)***SEC. 208. Terminal leave: On request of the Secretary*  
 4 *of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the*  
 5 *Treasury is authorized to transfer such amounts as may be*  
 6 *necessary, but not to exceed a total of \$300,000, from un-*  
 7 *obligated balances of appropriations for the Department of*  
 8 *Health, Education, and Welfare, fiscal year 1953, to an*  
 9 *appropriation account to be established for the payment of*  
 10 *annual leave of employees separated from the service as a result*  
 11 *of reductions of appropriations provided herein in excess of*  
 12 *the average turn-over of employees in said Department over*  
 13 *the period 1947-1952, to remain available until December*  
 14 *31, 1953.*

15       This title may be cited as the “Department of Health,  
 16 Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1954”.

### 17       TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS

#### 18                               BOARD

19       Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
 20 National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions  
 21 vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947  
 22 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses  
 23 of attendance of meetings concerned with the work of the  
 24 Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the  
 25 General Counsel; and services as authorized by section 15 of

1 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; ~~(62)\$9,000,-~~  
 2 ~~000 \$9,250,000~~: *Provided*, That no part of this appropria-  
 3 tion shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agri-  
 4 cultural laborers or used in connection with investigations,  
 5 hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units  
 6 composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2  
 7 (3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as  
 8 amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947,  
 9 and as defined in sections 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938  
 10 (52 Stat. 1060), and including in said definition employees  
 11 engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals,  
 12 reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on a  
 13 mutual, nonprofit basis and at least 95 per centum of the  
 14 water stored or supplied thereby is used for farming purposes.

15 This title may be cited as the "National Labor Relations  
 16 Board Appropriation Act, 1954".

#### 17 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

18 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
 19 National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting  
 20 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
 21 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$429,000.

22 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses neces-  
 23 sary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of the  
 24 Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157), and  
 25 emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant to



1 section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including steno-  
 2 graphic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the  
 3 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$138,000.

#### 4 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
 6 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic  
 7 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
 8 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$497,000, of which not  
 9 less than ~~(63)\$200,000~~ \$181,000 shall be available for  
 10 compensation (at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and  
 11 expenses of referees appointed pursuant to section 3 of the  
 12 Railway Labor Act, as amended.

13 This title may be cited as the "National Mediation Board  
 14 Appropriation Act, 1954".

#### 15 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

16 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust  
 17 funds) : For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement  
 18 Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of at-  
 19 tendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board  
 20 when specifically authorized by the Board; ~~(64)~~ *purchase of*  
 21 *one passenger motor vehicle, for replacement only*; and steno-  
 22 graphic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the  
 23 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$6,207,000, to be  
 24 derived from the railroad retirement account.

## REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

Payment to railroad retirement account: Appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 and prior fiscal years are hereby reduced by the sum of \$18,656,682, which shall be carried to the surplus of the Treasury.

This title may be cited as the "Railroad Retirement Board Appropriation Act, 1954".

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND  
CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171–180, 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor relations at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$3,200,000.

Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay necessary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the President pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176–180, 182), including



1 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,  
2 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rent in the District of Columbia,  
3 \$10,000.

4 This title may be cited as the “Federal Mediation and  
5 Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1954”.

6 TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

7 SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained  
8 in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of  
9 any person who engages in a strike against the Government  
10 of the United States or who is a member of an organization  
11 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike  
12 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-  
13 cates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the  
14 overthrow of the Government of the United States by force  
15 or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affi-  
16 davit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the per-  
17 son making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions  
18 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government  
19 of the United States, is not a member of an organization of  
20 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against  
21 the Government of the United States, or that such person  
22 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization  
23 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the  
24 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That  
25 any person who engages in a strike against the Government

1 of the United States or who is a member of an organization  
2 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike  
3 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-  
4 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,  
5 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by  
6 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or  
7 wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained  
8 in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction,  
9 shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not  
10 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the  
11 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in  
12 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

13 SEC. 702. No part of any appropriation contained in this  
14 Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not  
15 authorized by the Congress.

16 SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this  
17 Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee  
18 engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that  
19 would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one  
20 hundred and five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and  
21 intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*,  
22 That for purposes of this section employees shall be consid-  
23 ered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time  
24 or more in personnel administration consisting of direction  
25 and administration of the personnel program; employment,



1 placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification;  
2 employee relations and services; training; committees of  
3 expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage  
4 administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

5 This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Labor and  
6 Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1954."

Passed the House of Representatives May 26, 1953.

Attest:

LYLE O. SNADER,

*Clerk.*

Passed the Senate with amendments July 7 (legislative  
day, July 6), 1953.

Attest:

J. MARK TRICE,

*Secretary.*





---

## AN ACT

---

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 7, 1953

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the  
Senate numbered

and glorious and at times painful history, has capital of its own, and the South knows how to use that capital."

Neither stockholders nor the great majority of production workers in southern mills have opposed technological advances which make for more and better products at lower cost, for they understand that to ignore or oppose those improvements is to oppose their own best interest, he said. "There is," he continued, "obviously wide recognition of the fact that the distribution of these benefits (of increased productivity) must be fair and equitable, in accordance with best managerial judgment as dictated by given economic and business conditions. As a result, distribution of the benefits of increased productivity is among employees in the form of reasonable wages and good working conditions, among stockholders in the form of reasonable earnings on their investments, and among consumers in the form of goods which the public wants at a price the public can pay."

Senator MAYBANK said, however, that "economic statesmanship" encompasses more than an equitable sharing of productivity benefits; also, he stressed, it involves "the husbanding of resources, prudent policies of public spending at the local and State levels of government, and the reinvestment of industry earnings in plants and machinery, with a constant awareness of the truth that if managerial judgment should be faulty or should be forced to give way to outside pressures, the resulting maldistribution of productivity benefits would most certainly paralyze progress."

For these reasons, he said Southern States have not plunged into "lavish projects based on deficit financing" and the populace of the South "refrains from burdening southern industry unduly by financial demands which would increase the cost of doing business in the region." Thus, he pointed out, industry finds greater incentive to plow back earnings into bigger and better productive facilities "and in this manner industries and the whole economy are continually undergoing a process of self-rejuvenation, keeping young and vigorous."

Senator MAYBANK asserted that regions or countries which profess to have reached so-called economic maturity frequently have perplexing problems which suggest that their maturity is in reality a condition of approaching old age or weariness or of becoming worn out.

"Can it be," he asked, "that such regions are paying the penalty of failure or inability to translate their scientific progress into lower prices for the buyers of their products? Is it perhaps possible that in their zeal to promote expensive social welfare schemes, they have stifled industrial initiative by running up the costs of doing business? Have they, either blindly in their altruism, or in surrendering to various kinds of pressures, lost the sense of economic balance? Have they saddled themselves with burdens too heavy for their industries to bear, in the face of the competitive situation both domestically and abroad?"

Declaring that the new South offers America a "living example" of the dynamic driving force of free enterprise which has made it great, the southerner admonished: "Let us keep uppermost in mind the fact that America's progress has always been directly related to the continued expansion of her business and industry. From the day the Constitution came into being, this Nation has never stood still for long. America's basic economic power stems from its determination and its ability to grow, to expand from the base, to develop something new, to find better and more efficient ways of doing things, to provide more and better things for more people."

In an obvious reference to New England, he asserted "no good can come by one region trying to impose upon other regions that are more adaptable for certain industries the very faults and ailments which cause its own hardships."

He said the southern industrial revolution is a continuing, dynamic upsurge because its leadership seems convinced that "apparently there are no visible limits to the variety or volume of human consumption" and "the capacity of man to enjoy the fruits of his labor recognizes no boundaries."

"New processes, new techniques, new designs for plants, the ingenious use of raw materials and supplies of power and water—these are the demands of modern industry and these demands are being met promptly and adequately in the South."

Senator MAYBANK cited that since 1919, earliest year for which Census Bureau figures are available, the four largest textile States on a basis of their cotton system spindles—the Carolinas, Georgia, and Alabama—have seen textile jobs pyramid from 176,000 to 508,000, a three-fold increase, and total wages and salaries rise from \$136,447,000 annually to \$1,308,000,000 in 1951, a ten-fold increase.

Senator MAYBANK said friendly civic attitudes as well as economic statesmanship and a recognition that industry's responsibility to economic and social progress go beyond matters of individual gain and expediency have made vital contributions to the South's industrial development. "When you travel from one Southern community to another," he said, "you find evidence everywhere of industry's constant striving to create a wealth of greater human values. Some simple manifestations of this are to be seen in the fine new school buildings in many of the textile areas, the community centers, the ultra-modern hospitals, the recreational facilities—advantages to be used and enjoyed by all the people."

The Southerner asserted "the evolution in civic and social consciousness" on the part of industry, as so well exemplified in the South today, "had to come about gradually, and could not be forced or legislated, but rather 'had to take place in the human heart and soul of business.'"

"The popular support given various programs of social reform undertaken by Government during recent years furnished ample evidence of a generally felt need for industry's acceptance of these greater obligations," he continued. "However, it was largely a case of putting the cart in front of the horse."

Senator MAYBANK described the greater-than-ever responsibility of industry to economic and social progress as "that point where the decision to install new machinery or to build an employee health clinic is not made as an expedient for self-aggrandizement under the compulsion of competition alone, but as a duty of simple good citizenship." This attitude, he said, is common in the Southeast.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of June 12, 1953]

#### NEW SOUTH ON ITS WAY

Senator MAYBANK's address to the United States Senate on industrial growth in the South is both proper and timely. His remarks, to be amplified in two more speeches, follow and in some measure answer a spokesman for New England.

As New England's old and tired industrial machine slows down, the South is picking up. It is high time. We have come a long way, and we still have far to go. Borrowing a phrase of the late F. D. Roosevelt, "We are on our way." That way, we hope, will be based on the brawn and brains and natural resources of the South and not on Government handouts.

Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts recently suggested Federal spending had helped the South attract industries, and now New England wants some, too.

Southern progress comes from much more than Federal spending. The textile industry, on which Mr. MAYBANK dwelt in his first speech Wednesday, is a splendid example. The spinning and weaving mills used to be centered in New England. Today the center is in the Carolinas, where more than half the country's textiles are produced.

More mills are moving in. Cotton and synthetics already are here and wool is coming. Our region seems ideally suited for textiles. And this is no Government venture. It is free enterprise.

New England had her chance and now is losing the mills. Senator MAYBANK touched on some of the reasons. We shall not attempt today to exhaust the subject, but the results are self-evident.

Textiles are not the only industry coming South. Wood products are a vast source of wealth. So is the chemical industry.

Along with the rest of the South, Charleston is flexing its industrial muscles. The same issue of the News and Courier that reported Mr. MAYBANK's speech announced the good news from the Charleston Development Board that a new \$2 million plant would be located here. Though the name has not yet been divulged, we are informed this is to be a new branch of a New England concern—not a textile factory. One of the reasons for locating here, we presume, is to reach the southern market, for wealth begets wealth. The more basic industries a region has, the greater its ability to buy products and services of other industries.

As John Temple Graves expressed it, the South is playing leapfrog. Late in exploiting the industrial revolution, it can profit by the mistakes of other regions. We do not want to be a carbon copy of Boston, Pittsburgh, Detroit, or Youngstown, Ohio. We want to stay southern, with a proper balance between industry and agriculture. We want to preserve our customs and our culture. And we want to accept prosperity like gentlemen.

Let us not be dominated by other people's thinking. We do not need them to show us the way. We have made it alone so far. We welcome those who join us in peace and harmony. We shall not be taken over by a new wave of carpetbaggers.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 5246, the 1954 appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, as proposed to be amended by the Committee on Appropriations, be considered as an original text for the purpose of amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand, if any Senator wishes to offer an amend-



ment to a committee amendment he will have the right to do so.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. No amendment to a committee amendment will be foreclosed.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. Therefore, the committee amendments will be considered as having been agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 14, after the figures "\$1,350,000", to strike out "Provided, That the compensation of the Solicitor shall be \$14,800 per annum" and insert "Provided, That hereafter the compensation of the Solicitor shall be at a rate equal to the rate established by law for grade GS-18."

On page 3, line 7, after the word "exhibits", to insert "and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards", and in line 9, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "\$624,000" and insert "\$700,000."

On page 3, line 25, after "(29 U. S. C. 50)", to strike out "\$3,400,000" and insert "\$3,230,000."

On page 4, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "\$5,100,000" and insert "\$5,225,000."

On page 5, line 1, after "(66 Stat. 684)", to strike out "\$187,300,000" and insert "\$197,110,000", and in line 6, after the word "paid", to insert "or salary costs."

On page 7, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "\$41,000,000" and insert "\$38,500,000."

On page 9, line 7, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)" to strike out "\$5,250,000" and insert "\$5,345,000."

On page 9, line 12, after the word "exhibits", to strike out "\$360,000" and insert "\$350,000."

On page 10, line 1, after the word "Division", to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$6,250,000."

On page 10, after line 10, to insert:

"SEC. 103. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation in this title may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be used for creation of new functions within the Department."

On page 10, after line 16, to insert:

"SEC. 104. Terminal leave: On request of the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer such amounts as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$300,000, from unobligated balances of appropriations for the Department of Labor, fiscal year 1953, to an appropriation account to be established for the payment of annual leave of employees separated from the service as a result of reductions of appropriations provided herein in excess of the average turn-over of employees in said Department over the period 1947-1952, to remain available until December 31, 1953."

On page 11, after line 19, to insert:

"For an additional amount for the construction of buildings to accommodate deaf children at the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, \$41,100."

On page 12, line 11, after the word "operations", to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$5,200,000."

On page 14, line 8, after the word "buildings", to strike out "For the purchase and installation of a vacuum pump in the steam system, \$20,000" and insert "For the alteration and improvement of power plant facilities, including engineering and architectural services, \$170,000."

On page 14, line 21, after the word "year", to insert a colon and "Provided further, That not more than \$450,000 of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations."

On page 15, line 17, after the figures "\$2,500,000", to insert "of which not less than \$480,000 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized."

On page 16, after line 5, to insert:

"School construction: The amount made available under this head in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1953, for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies is increased from '\$750,000' to '\$1,250,000.'"

On page 16, line 20, after the word "agency", to strike out "\$23,000,000" and insert "\$21,850,000", and on page 17, line 3, after the word "purposes" to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That after payment of amounts certified to be due for prior fiscal years, the funds herein appropriated shall be apportioned among the States in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary to insure equitable maintenance and improvement of the State programs; and the obligation of the United States to any State under such act for fiscal year 1954 shall not exceed the amount so apportioned to such State."

On page 18, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "\$690,000" and insert "\$655,500."

On page 19, line 6, after the figures "\$13,250,000", to insert "of which not more than \$2,400,000 shall be available for personnel services."

On page 19, line 14, after the figures "\$5,000,000", to insert "of which not less than \$400,000 shall be used for studies, prevention, and control activities on poliomyelitis."

On page 19, line 24, after "(33 U. S. C. 466-466(j))", to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$3,325,000."

On page 20, line 15, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$60,000,000."

On page 20, line 25, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$750,000" and insert "\$1,000,000."

On page 22, line 18, after the word "others", to strike out "and the proceeds thereof may be credited to this appropriation" and insert "at rates determined by him to be sufficient to recover the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be credited to this appropriation."

On page 23, line 5, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$17,887,000" and insert "\$20,487,000."

On page 23, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "\$10,895,000" and insert "\$12,345,000."

On page 23, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "\$12,000,000" and insert "\$15,418,000."

On page 23, line 16, after the word "conditions", to strike out "\$1,650,000" and insert "\$1,740,000."

On page 23, line 19, after the word "diseases", to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$7,000,000."

On page 23, line 24, to strike out "\$5,479,200" and insert "\$5,738,000."

On page 24, line 2, after the word "blindness", to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$4,750,000."

On page 25, line 3, after the word "such", to strike out "other funds appropriated in this act to the National Institutes of Health as the Surgeon General may determine, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any stocks of supplies and equipment of the Public Health Service related to services financed under this fund may also be used to capitalize said fund" and insert "unobligated balances of 1953 appropriations of the National Institutes of Health as the

Surgeon General may determine, to be available without fiscal year limitation: *Provided*, That supplies, materials, stocks, and equipment heretofore or hereafter derived by transfers to this fund may also be used to capitalize said fund: *Provided further*, That such funds may be reimbursed in advance from available funds of organizations covering estimated or actual charges for services, supplies, and materials furnished and operating expenses, including reserves for accrued annual leave."

On page 27, line 1, after the word "For", to strike out "beginning" and insert "preparing for"; in line 7, after the word "expended", to strike out the colon and the following provisos: "Provided, That appropriations for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to the General Services Administration, but the selection of the site and the building plans shall be subject to approval by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the total cost of the project herein authorized shall not exceed \$27 million, but this limitation may be exceeded, or shall be reduced, by an amount equal to the percentage increase or decrease, if any, in construction costs generally dating from January 1, 1953, as determined by the Administrator of General Services."

On page 28, line 2, to strike out "\$1,600,000" and insert "\$1,550,000."

On page 28, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$1,450,000."

On page 29, line 5, after the word "State", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That, in computing allotments to States under sections 502, 512, and 521 (a) of such act for the current fiscal year, balances in allotments previously made to States which remain available in the Federal Treasury for payment to them as of July 1, 1953, shall be taken into account by (1) adding the total of such balances to the appropriation herein made, and (2) subtracting from each resulting allotment to any State under section 502 (a), 512 (a), or 521 (a) any balance in any year prior allotment under such section which remains available in the Federal Treasury for payment to it as of such date but with such adjustments as may be necessary to assure that this proviso does not operate to deprive any State of any balance in an allotment previously made to it under such section."

On page 31, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$168,000" and insert "\$175,000."

On page 31, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$25,000", and at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "\$355,000" and insert "\$375,000."

On page 32, line 2, after the word "health", to strike out "\$450,000" and insert "\$255,000."

On page 32, after line 2, to insert: "Working capital fund: The working capital fund established in the Federal Security Appropriations Act, 1953, shall hereafter be available for financing such control services as the Secretary determines may be performed more advantageously on a reimbursable basis."

On page 33, line 11, after the word "on", to strike out "the date of approval of this act" and insert "June 30, 1954."

On page 33, line 25, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$100,000", and on page 34, line 3, after the word "made", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That hereafter appropriations to the Public Health Service for salaries and expenses shall be available for reimbursement to commissioned officers of the Service for the use of taxicabs and other means of conveyance (including reimbursement for use of privately owned vehicles) within and around their designated



posts of duty, such reimbursement to be on the same basis and subject to the same limitations as for civilian officers and employees, and subject to the approval of the Surgeon General or his authorized agent."

On page 35, after line 2, to insert: "SEC. 207. In order to more effectively administer the programs and functions of the Department, the Secretary is authorized to transfer not to exceed 2½ percent of any appropriation in this title available for salaries and expenses to any other such appropriation but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 2½ percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be used for the creation of new functions within the Department."

On page 35, after line 10, to insert: "SEC. 208. Terminal leave: On request of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer such amounts as may be necessary, but not to exceed a total of \$300,000, from unobligated balances of appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, fiscal year 1953, to an appropriation account to be established for the payment of annual leave of employees separated from the service as a result of reductions of appropriations provided herein in excess of the average turnover of employees in said Department over the period 1947-52, to remain available until December 31, 1953."

On page 37, line 20, after the word "than", to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$181,000."

On page 38, line 8, after the word "Board", to insert "purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, for replacement only."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the amount of the bill as it passed the House was \$1,980,706,461. The net amount added by the committee was \$27,729,300. The total of the bill as reported to the Senate is \$2,008,435,761. The amount of the original 1954 budget estimate was \$2,098,062,861. The revised budget estimate was \$2,021,513,470. The amount of the 1953 appropriations was \$2,254,781,300.

I state these figures so that at the beginning of the consideration of the pending bill we may have a clear understanding and knowledge of the figures as of 1953 and the figures which the committee considered, first in the original recommendations of President Truman, and then the revised recommendations of President Eisenhower's administration.

The bill as reported to the Senate is \$89,627,100 below the original budget estimate. It is \$13,077,709 below the revised budget estimate. It is \$246,345,539 below the 1953 appropriations.

Mr. President, the committee increased the amount for health in a very substantial manner, particularly in the research field in connection with cancer, heart, and other diseases.

I should like to read the specific figures which relate to the National Cancer Institute, in order that Senators may know what the committee has done.

In 1953 the appropriation for the National Cancer Institute was \$17,887,000. In the original budget recommendation the amount recommended was \$22 million. The revised estimate called for \$15,780,000. The House allowed \$17,887,000. The committee recommendation is \$20,487,000, for cancer research.

It will be noted that the committee has recommended a very substantial increase. I may say that, from all the information which we were able to gather through the hearings, we reached the

conclusion that cancer research, heart research, and the other health research programs will go forward with all the haste and with all the effectiveness that could possibly be given to the programs by the moneys allowed for such research purposes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I have received a great many telegrams advising me that the cut in the tuberculosis appropriation amounts to approximately \$2 million. I wonder whether the Senator could give me some information in that regard.

Mr. THYE. We followed the revised estimates in that connection, I will say to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. In my State the State health department is very much concerned about it. In North Dakota, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota knows, a great many Indians are suffering from tuberculosis.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. The State of North Dakota operates a tuberculosis home at Dunseith, N. Dak. It was felt that the cut was too severe. I wonder what the distinguished Senator has to say relative to the appropriation for tuberculosis research.

Mr. THYE. As I have said, the committee followed the revised budget recommendations. The information which we had was to the effect that the program could be carried on very effectively with that amount. That was the reason why the Committee on Appropriations followed the revised recommendations of the Budget Bureau on that item.

Mr. LANGER. Was there any specific hearing held on the subject of tuberculosis?

Mr. THYE. Oh, yes. Hearings were held with respect to all health measures. If the Senator will glance at a report of the hearings, he will find that testimony was heard on all the items in the appropriation bill.

Mr. LANGER. Does the distinguished Senator from Minnesota himself personally believe that the amount is sufficient?

Mr. THYE. It is the best judgment of the Budget Bureau and of the Committee on Appropriations that the sum of money recommended can serve the purpose and carry forward the health program in the tuberculosis field.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to inquire further on that subject. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is aware of the fact that under the displaced persons program there came into this country some displaced persons who, it was later found out in Europe, had been admitted into this country while suffering from tuberculosis. The public health officials got hold of those cases later. There are now in New York State alone hundreds of such cases which are costing the State of New York over a million dollars a year to take care of. These are cases of displaced persons suffering from tuberculosis. I wonder whether any testimony was taken on that point.

Mr. THYE. Not insofar as displaced persons are concerned and the problem the Nation is confronted with in connection with tuberculosis among them. However, in the overall, general health measures, particularly with respect to tuberculosis, the feeling was that in the past, because of the extensive field research conducted by the mobile X-ray units, not only have the States become acquainted with the problem and advanced themselves in that field, but the National Government has done much work along that line. It was felt that we have progressed sufficiently so that the recommended appropriation can carry on the search for persons afflicted with tuberculosis and also provide the necessary cure and care. I think we are underway, and that there will be available sufficient funds with which to continue the program as the Senator from North Dakota and I would like to see it carried forward. Of course, there is no limit to what we could spend for general health research because it is such a vast field.

Mr. LANGER. How does the amount appropriated this year compare with the amount appropriated last year?

Mr. THYE. Last year there was appropriated \$8,240,000. President Truman's budget recommendation was \$7,645,000. The revised estimate was \$5,725,000. The amount allowed by the House was \$5,725,000. The Senate committee has recommended the same amount, \$5,725,000.

So, taking into consideration all the work which had been done by the mobile units, and what had been accomplished in the past, it was felt that the appropriation in this year's bill could be safely reduced.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I share the concern of the Senator from North Dakota about adequate funds being provided for research in the field of tuberculosis, and for somewhat the same reason the Senator from North Dakota has expressed. The battle against tuberculosis among the Indian tribes has been a difficult one because of the housing conditions under which the Indians are required to live or have lived.

I wish to speak in commendation of the committee report with respect to the other health fields. I note from the committee report that the National Cancer Institute, under the recommendations of the committee, will receive \$20,487,000, as against \$17,887,000 in the current year. I commend the committee for that recommendation.

It happens that within the past 10 days I have lost a very dear friend, himself a doctor, who was head of a branch of the Veterans' Administration in Washington for a good many years, and also served in the field. Although he knew and although those whom he consulted knew some things that might have been done, they did not know all that could be done. I have a feeling that his life might have been spared if we had progressed just a little further in this field. So I commend the commit-



tee for its recommendation regarding that item.

I point out that the committee's recommendation for mental-health activities exceeds the appropriation for the current year. The appropriation for the current year is \$10,895,000, and the committee's recommendation is \$12,345,000. I trust there was no serious opposition in the committee to that recommendation.

Again I wish to commend the committee for its consideration of the program of the National Heart Institute. The appropriation for the current year is \$12 million. The committee has recommended an appropriation of \$15,418,000.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, every committee member realized the importance of the health research these items cover. Therefore, the committee felt justified in increasing the amount not only over what was appropriated for the fiscal year 1953, but also over the revised budget estimates. I have the feeling—and I can speak for the other members of the Appropriations Subcommittee—that in the field of research, whether it be research relative to cancer or research relative to heart diseases or research relative to mental conditions or research relative to any other field of health, a few million dollars can do a tremendous amount of good in aiding the scientists who are engaged in that work.

We would like to have some additional funds made available for building programs; but I have the positive assurance that the general research in these fields will not suffer even though funds are not made available for building expansion. In that connection I read from page 635 of the committee hearings. I asked:

That is the question that I had in mind here: Would the research be curtailed unless there was an expansion in the physical plants?

Dr. Scheele replied:

No, sir.

So I wish to assure the Senate that we took into consideration the question of whether we should appropriate funds for additional buildings or for expansion of the physical facilities of the research laboratories. With the assurance of Dr. Scheele, the surgeon general of the Public Health Service, that the general research activities would go forward even though we did not provide funds for expansion of the physical plants, we felt that if we provided increased appropriations for the research activities, they would go forward.

As a committee, we shall examine very carefully what the building needs are, and we have so instructed the committee staff. At the next session of Congress we shall have available adequate information to enable us to reach a decision as to what appropriations we wish to recommend for plant expansion in the field of scientific research.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the assurance of the Senator from Minnesota on that point is most encouraging. It indicates that the proposed increases in ap-

propriations will actually be devoted to the work for which these various programs were instituted.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. CASE. I should also like to refer to the item for arthritis and metabolic disease activities. It is one in which I have an especial interest. Here, again, I note that the committee has recommended an increased appropriation in the amount of \$7 million, whereas the appropriation for the 1953 fiscal year was \$4,568,900. Thus, the committee's recommendation indicates a definite expansion of the program.

Let me say that I have referred to the appropriations for the current year in each instance, rather than the budget estimates, because to the layman and the Senator who does not serve on the Appropriations Committee, the appropriation for the current year, when compared to the recommended appropriation for the next fiscal year, indicates, in the case of the items to which I have referred, an increase in the activities themselves. When we examine the budget estimates, it is difficult to know what the comparison means; but when we know what the current appropriation is and when we find that an increase over the current appropriation has been recommended, the layman can understand that it is proposed that the work actually be expanded.

I am glad to have the assurance of the chairman of the subcommittee regarding the committee's recommendations in all four of these fields.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the subcommittee devoted a great deal of time to its study of health items and permitted all persons who wished to testify at the hearings, in regard to those items of the bill, to do so. We heard much testimony, as the printed hearings indicate.

It was our best judgment that whenever the facts justified it, we should recommend the appropriation of such funds as could wisely be expended in the field of research, in order to advance as rapidly as possible the work of the scientists who are seeking to find the answers in the case of diseases which are causing so much grief in the homes of persons afflicted with such diseases.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I wish to invite attention to the item of salaries and expenses, under the Bureau of Employment Security, on page 4, lines 1 to 11. I am not satisfied with the appropriation the committee recommended for that purpose.

Mr. THYE. I wish to say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Arizona—and let me say there is no member of the Appropriations Committee who is better informed on any of these items than is he—that if I had been permitted to make my complete statement, I would already have said there are three specific groups of items in reference to which I personally feel the

committee was too conservative. I shall mention those items in the order in which they appear in the bill.

The first is the item for salaries and expenses for the Office of the Secretary of Labor. I think we were a little conservative regarding our recommendation of appropriations for the Secretary of Labor.

I also believe in all sincerity—and I have made a thorough study of the entire question—that we were too conservative in the case of the item of administrative funds for the United States Office of Education.

Furthermore, in the case of the appropriations for the Children's Bureau, I say in all frankness, as chairman of the subcommittee, that we were a little conservative.

I make this statement in order that the Senate may examine those items very carefully, in order to make any necessary corrections on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, this morning I received by messenger from President Eisenhower a letter which refers specifically to the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. President Eisenhower calls specifically to my attention and to the attention of the Senate that he has the feeling that the committee recommended possibly almost \$600,000 less than what is actually needed for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He has expressed the hope that \$426,000 can be reinstated in the appropriation for the Office of Education. He has also expressed the hope that \$151,000 might be restored to the item for the support of the Office of the Secretary; and, that, if there is concurrence on the part of the Senate, amendments to increase these items may be adopted.

Of course, previously I have stated that I believe the committee has been slightly conservative regarding the item for the Secretary of Labor, and for the work of the Children's Bureau.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in the case of the appropriation for the Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses, I did not realize at the time when we were marking up the bill that last year there was placed on that Bureau an added load which amounted to \$350,000, when it agreed to take over the unemployment-compensation work of the veterans' program. Last year the Bureau of Employment had an appropriation of \$5,679,000 for salaries and expenses and then revised budget estimate reduced the amount they are to have this year to \$5,435,000. The House of Representatives allowed only \$5,100,000. The Senate Committee on Appropriations added only \$125,000 to the amount allowed by the House of Representatives which is \$200,000 short of the revised budget estimate and \$761,000 below the original 1954 estimate submitted by President Truman last January.

In view of the additional load this Bureau had to take on, it seems to me it would be the part of wisdom to take to conference, in the case of this item, the amount of the revised budget estimate. That is as little as this Bureau can function with, if it is to perform the work



required of it. After all, Congress passed a bill directing that the work be done, and it should make provision for the necessary personnel and funds with which it can be done. The figure under consideration represents a substantial reduction below the Truman budget, and we should at least allow the \$5,435,000 recommended by the Eisenhower budget.

Mr. THYE. In respect to this particular item, the committee studied the matter very carefully, and, in the exercise of its best judgment, recommended an increase of \$125,000 over the House allowance, which is \$210,000 under the revised estimate. The Bureau, with the restoration here recommended, will be enabled to allocate the full amount of its budget request to the collection and interpretation of information regarding the labor market, and to the farm-placement service; the remainder of the increase to be used to assist in maintaining the public-employment service. This represents the best judgment of the committee.

There is one item of the Labor Department's appropriation regarding which I think the committee erred and that is in the recommendation that there be established a \$10 million contingent fund.

In providing for that fund, I believe we took too great an amount from the administrative funds. I think we might well reconsider the recommendation of \$10 million, and reduce the contingent fund to \$5 million. We would then provide another additional \$5 million for the purpose of administration; as a result of which the appropriation contained in the bill would be adequate for that field.

Mr. HAYDEN. The item to which I am referring limits the amount of salaries that can be paid in the Bureau of Employment Security. As the bill stands now, the amount is \$5,225,000. As I have said, the bureau took a cut in the last Congress of \$350,000. I should like to see appropriated for the bureau what the Eisenhower budget requested. An amendment to that effect could be taken to conference. I think the committee has trimmed it down too closely; it has reduced it to such a point that the Bureau cannot do the work it is required to do.

Among other things, we must realize that the Bureau saves the Government a great deal of money. As I have said it carries on the unemployment compensation work of the veterans' program, and maintains a central file in order to detect duplicate applications for unemployment compensation. Last year it was discovered that there were 675 duplicate claims. By duplicate claim I mean a case in which a man applies in one State, and then goes to another State to apply again. The aggregate amount of those duplicate claims during the past 6 months was about \$340,000. If this service is not maintained throughout the United States, the Government will suffer a much greater loss than the \$200,000 which my amendment would add to this appropriation.

The Bureau handles agricultural employment, and arranges for transporting agricultural labor from one State

to another. So far as the farming interests of the Nation are concerned, agricultural labor is needed. I therefore move to strike out "\$5,225,000" and restore the revised budget estimate of \$5,435,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Arizona state the page and line on which the amendment would be made?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is on page 4, line 9. I propose to strike out the "\$5,225,000" and insert "\$5,435,000."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. HAYDEN. I withhold it.

Mr. THYE. I ask unanimous consent that the President's letter dated July 7, 1953, be printed in the RECORD following my reference to the letter, in order that the full text may appear in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator would be good enough to read the letter. After all, if it is printed in the RECORD, none of us will have an opportunity to study it before tomorrow, by which time the bill may have been passed. I think it would be very enlightening for us to know what is in the letter.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I send the letter to the desk, and request that it be read for the benefit of all Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the letter for the information of the Senate.

The letter was read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, July 7, 1953.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: I learn that your committee has completed action on the appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, placing the matter now before the Senate for consideration. Admittedly at a very late date, therefore—and only because of their importance to the Nation—I bring to your attention two recent developments which, in my judgment, warrant an increase in your committee's recommended action in an amount of slightly less than \$600,000.

Let me first refer to the assumption of the duties of office, last Thursday, by Dr. Lee M. Thurston, the new Commissioner of Education. This has relevance to the proposed reduction below the revised budget for the Office of Education in an amount of \$426,000.

In addition, there is a proposed cut of \$151,000 for the support of the office of the Secretary. You may recall my message to the Congress requesting legislation to establish the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Therein I pointed out that the "activities between Federal and State Governments, including their local subdivisions, are the product of more than a century and a half of a piecemeal and often haphazard growth," and I stressed the necessity of making "a thorough study of grant-in-aid activities" and "the need to review and assess with prudence and foresight the proper relations of the State and local governments."

It is imperative that this Commission get promptly under way if it is to complete its

report in time for consideration by the next session of Congress, as I suggested in my message.

For this to be possible, much of the work of providing the Commission with fundamental information and technical assistance will unavoidably devolve upon the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I anticipate, as a matter of fact, that possibly as much as two-thirds of the problems with which this Commission will concern itself will fall within the purview of this newest Department.

All this vitally important work is in addition to that normally falling upon the Secretary. In the Secretary's office, moreover, must be reviewed all the planning for producing effectiveness and economy in this whole field of Federal responsibility; to make this relatively minor saving will seriously impair the ability of the Secretary to plan efficiently. Consequently, I urgently request the restoration of \$151,000.

Now going back to the first item, it is my view that our educational process is and must remain the primary responsibility of local communities and the States. But this is not to say that the essential and traditional functions of the Federal Government in this area should be fundamentally altered. On this, I am sure we are in accord.

For over 80 years the Congress has required the Office of Education to diffuse information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems and methods of teaching. The purpose has been to aid the people in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems and otherwise to promote the cause of education throughout the country. In keeping with this statutory mandate, the Government has assisted the States for scores of years by research, publication, consultation, and, in case of need, by grants-in-aid, to sustain and strengthen our system of popular education. Such services must, of course, retain their vitality. It is our purpose to increase their effectiveness to the greatest possible degree. I was pleased to note your Committee's own endorsement of this objective when you expressed the hope in your report that "the administration of the Office will be strengthened during the coming year."

As I mentioned earlier, only last Thursday Dr. Lee M. Thurston was sworn in as the new Commissioner of Education. I have full confidence in his ability. Without the \$426,000 Dr. Thurston's office will be severely handicapped.

Believing that the results of both these cuts are as little desired by you and your colleagues as by me, I hope that the Senate will restore these critically needed funds.

I am confident that if these funds are provided, the Congress as well as the executive branch will be highly gratified by their efficient administration under the sound leadership of Secretary Hobby and the new Commissioner of Education, Dr. Thurston.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "\$5,225,000" and insert "\$5,435,000."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the subcommittee and the full committee gave much consideration to this item in the appropriation bill, but it was the best judgment of the committee that the item we recommended, which would increase the House appropriation by \$125,000, would enable the Bureau adequately to carry on its program. Therefore, Mr. President, I regret that my distinguished



friend from Arizona has offered his amendment, because I do not like to be in disagreement with him.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this particular appropriation must go to conference, anyway, and there an amount somewhere between the budget estimate and the amount appropriated by the House will be allowed. I am convinced that in the committee we did not take into consideration the fact that this Bureau had absorbed \$350,000 last year by taking on work, which was not paid for, in handling veterans' compensation matters, and that now it is proposed to make an additional cut.

What I am asking for is the sum contained in the revised budget estimate submitted by the President. The Senate should allow it and take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to call up my amendment designated "7-6-53-B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,250,000" and insert "\$1,448,000."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in support of this amendment I should like to state that I talked the matter over very fully with the Secretary of Labor, and, in asking this relatively small increase, I am trying to cooperate with him in connection with the difficulties of his program.

I have a statement with reference to the matter which I should like to read to the Senate.

In the Department of Labor, the work of the Secretary's Office is as important to economy in the whole Department's operations as it is to efficiency.

This is because this Office provides central administrative services in handling personnel, processing of documents, library work, budget and management problems, instead of having this work done by people scattered throughout the nine operating bureaus and offices. This is obviously the economical way to handle these problems, and it provides economy and coordination that could not otherwise be obtained.

Most of the employees in the Secretary's Office are assigned to these central services, and it is plain that much of the efficiency of the operating bureaus depends upon adequate staffing of the Secretary's Office.

I may say, also, Mr. President, that the figure takes care of the salary not only of the Secretary himself, but of the Under Secretary, and the Assistant Secretary. So the amount is larger than that which was considered by the full committee.

There is a second consideration in the Secretary's Office appropriation. President Eisenhower has thrown upon the shoulders of Secretary Durkin an increased load of policy determinations in the field of labor and industrial relations, instead of retaining much of this work in the White House as President Truman did. Secretary Durkin needs a strong team to handle this increased load of policy work.

It is for these reasons that I am introducing an amendment to restore the budget for the Secretary's Office to the level originally recommended by the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

The Secretary's Office in fiscal year 1953 operated on a budget of \$1,764,000, with 313 employees, most of whom are relatively low-paid workers in service jobs, engaged in administrative service operations. The Truman budget proposed to reduce this figure to \$1,585,000, and Secretary Durkin came before the Senate Appropriations Committee 3 months ago and volunteered an across-the-board departmental reduction, including a cut in his own Office to \$1,525,000.

The bill before us would reduce this further to \$1,250,000, and the Secretary's staff would be reduced to 230 persons.

This cut amounts to 25 percent, and is deeper relatively than any of the cuts made in the other bureaus which make up the Department. I submit that it is not compatible with the Administration's policy.

My amendment would raise the appropriation to \$1,448,000. This is \$77,000 less than the amount asked for by Secretary Durkin.

I have talked it over with the Secretary of Labor and he has agreed to my offering this amendment.

The Secretary's Office handles coordination of national and local manpower activities, working with the White House, Defense Department, and procurement agencies, and the proposed curtailment will curtail the work of Secretary Durkin's Department in providing information and expert assistance in this field. I do not believe that anyone acquainted with this situation foresees any great reduction in our efforts to meet conditions which may exist in the event the Nation had to mobilize quickly. This manpower effort is the center of our planning to maintain high levels of employment, and to coordinate action to get work and jobs into the areas which now have substantial labor surpluses.

The world situation is still unsettled, and it is still necessary to get our basic defense plans in order, including those for manpower. The administration is continuing every reasonable effort to make the Nation ready for all eventualities, and the Department of Labor has the significant responsibility of preparing the manpower mobilization plans. Restoration of the Secretary's Office appropriation to the reduced figure I have proposed will enable the Secretary to carry forward his part in this program.

This entire Secretary's Office appropriation amounts to only about one-half of 1 percent of the Labor Department

appropriation, and I believe that it is a very reasonable price for leadership, of the kind that Martin Durkin can give this Department, if he has the tools with which to do his job.

So, Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I feel that I have a responsibility to give the Secretary of Labor support in asking that this very reasonable increase be made in the item which appears on page 2, line 11 of the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that in my opening remarks I stated that I thought we had been too conservative in the item of administrative expenses for the Secretary of Labor. The subcommittee recommended \$1,448,000, but in the full committee that amount was reduced. For that reason, Mr. President, it is my strong conviction that the Senate should accept the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, because it is in accordance with what the subcommittee felt was the appropriate amount. That was its recommendation after going through lengthy hearings on the question.

So, Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee, I am perfectly willing to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I should like to yield, first, to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak on a different question.

Mr. THYE. Then I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am most happy that the Senator from Minnesota has accepted this amendment and will take it to conference. The subcommittee, after the hearings and after listening to the testimony, recommended the amount stated by the Senator from Minnesota, which amount was reduced by the full committee. I am glad that the Senator will take the amendment to conference and will try to work it out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to return for a moment to the item of control of tuberculosis. The appropriation for 1953 was \$8,240,000. The original budget estimate for 1954 was \$7,645,000. The amount recommended in the bill is \$5,725,000.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, would the Senator from New York mind telling us from what he is reading?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am reading from page 28 of the report, under the Public Health Service.

The amount recommended in the bill before the Senate is \$5,725,000, which represents a decrease from the appropriation of 1953 of \$2,515,000, or about 30 percent.



Of course, I realize that very great progress has been made in the control of tuberculosis, so perhaps some decrease from the amount appropriated last year may be justified. But the proposed appropriation, being 30 percent less than that which was voted last year, and which was used, I believe, constructively and effectively, is so much lower than it would appear to me that we would be taking a very great step backward if we made the reduction.

Both the Senator from Minnesota and I, while we were Governors of our respective States, had experience with the continuing efforts which must be made to control tuberculosis. There is no question that much progress has been made along these lines. However, I should very much dislike to see taken a step backward, which would result in a growth in the incidence of tuberculosis, which I think can be controlled successfully, provided a reasonable amount of money is appropriated for the purpose.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I think the distinguished Senator from New York was not on the floor when I brought up the matter the first thing this morning. I have in my hand various telegrams relating to this item. Has the Senator from New York offered an amendment?

Mr. THYE. No; he is speaking to the item in the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have not offered an amendment; I am speaking to the item in the bill.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from New York is speaking to the same question raised by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LEHMAN. Like the Senator from North Dakota, I have received a number of telegrams protesting this very drastic reduction in amount.

Mr. LANGER. I have a telegram from James A. Swomley, executive director, North Dakota Tuberculosis and Health Association, Bismarck, N. Dak., asking that the amount be restored.

I have also a telegram from the Hettinger County Tuberculosis and Health Association, signed by Kasper Niederkorn, secretary, stating:

Restoration of the \$2,515,000 cut by the House from Federal tuberculosis appropriation is urgently requested. To permit this cut at this time would jeopardize the whole tuberculosis control movement which has done so much toward control of this dread disease in the State of North Dakota as well as throughout the Nation.

At this time I move that the amount cut from the appropriation, \$2,515,000, be restored.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator from New York had been recognized, so the motion of the Senator from North Dakota would be out of order for the moment, because the Senator from New York was speaking to the very same question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall finish very shortly, in order to give the Senator from North Dakota an opportunity to submit his proposed amendment. In the mean-

time, I would ask the Senator from Minnesota to allow me to advise the Senate that I have in my hand a strong telegram from George J. Nelbach, of the Committee on Tuberculosis and Public Health, of the State Charities Aid Association, of New York, urging restoration of the cut. Also, I have a telegram to the same effect from the president of the Brooklyn Tuberculosis and Health Association of the State of New York, and a letter from the executive director of the Queensborough Tuberculosis and Health Association, also urging restoration of the cut.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Referring to the committee recommendation with respect to the appropriation for control of tuberculosis, it was the best judgment of the committee that the amount allowed was sufficient, because it is the amount of the revised budget recommendation. It is the amount the House appropriated, in which the Senate subcommittee and full Committee on Appropriations concurred. We took into consideration all the mobile units, and we suggested to the administrators that they might use mobile units in the smaller cities of the Nation, since smaller cities in all probability could not afford extensive research in control of tuberculosis, as larger cities could. We felt that since the larger metropolitan areas of the Nation had really pioneered in the use of mobile units, and had done the initial research work in that field, mobile units should be used in smaller cities, in order to aid smaller cities to locate persons afflicted with tubercular diseases, because a smaller city could not afford a mobile unit, whereas a metropolitan center could afford one.

After careful study and consideration of the question, the committee felt the amount agreed on was a proper amount for the Federal Government to appropriate toward tubercular disease control. I regret to have to oppose any request in the field of health, but that was the conviction of the committee on this item.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call the distinguished Senator's attention to the fact that nowhere is the fight against tuberculosis more important than among the Indians. A short time ago, in company with Mrs. Langer, I was in New Mexico and spent a week among the Navahos. We found the situation there to be very bad. The situation in North Dakota is also bad. I wish to read again a telegram I have received from North Dakota. It comes from people who have been fighting tuberculosis for years. The telegram reads:

Restoration of the \$2,515,000 cut by the House from Federal tuberculosis appropriation is urgently requested. To permit this cut at this time would jeopardize whole tuberculosis control movement which has done so much toward control of this dread disease in the State of North Dakota as well as throughout the nation.

HETTINGER COUNTY TUBERCULOSIS AND HEALTH ASSOCIATION,  
KASPER NIEDERKORN, Secretary.

As the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] said earlier today, there is no disease in that region that has done more harm among the Indian population

and among poor and underprivileged people than tuberculosis.

Mr. THYE. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that health work among the Indians comes under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. LANGER. I understand.

Mr. THYE. So far as the Senator is speaking to that question, the matter is related to the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior. What we are now considering is an entirely different field from that of care of Indians.

Mr. LANGER. Indians are admitted into the tuberculosis institution at Dunseith, N. Dak. They may be only one sixty-fourth Indian, or, as the distinguished Senator from Vermont has said, one one-hundred-and-twenty-eighth. I appeal on behalf of all underprivileged people in North Dakota, regardless of race, because our tuberculosis home is so overcrowded that it cannot take care of those who apply.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With reference to the statement made by the Senator from North Dakota, there is no question that the Government does not do enough for the health of Indians. I am positive of that. But it happens that, generally speaking, the particular item we are now discussing affects Indians very little.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would join at any time in increasing tenfold the appropriation for the Interior Department for public health work among the Indians. It is true that they are neglected, forgotten, and sick. However, so far as this particular item in the bill is concerned, it affects the Indians very little. I have received telegrams from my State, which I read before the committee. The item affects generally those who are non-Indians.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say in response that I am appealing not only for the Indians. I mention them purely incidentally.

The mobile units referred to by the Senator from Minnesota have been organized and have done a magnificent job all over the United States. Apparently because they have done a good job, we are about to penalize them by cutting off a part of their appropriation. I am only asking for the same amount which was allowed for mobile units last year. I therefore move, on page 18, line 24, that the figures—

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be clear, and in order that there may be no misunderstanding as to whether the United States Government does anything for Indians in connection with general health and welfare, let me say that the Interior Department has an appropriation for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for health, education, and welfare services. The committee this year recommended \$52,300,000, and the Senate approved that amount. So there can be no question as to care and Government assistance in the case of Indians, including tubercu-



losis control and hospital care. Our Indian people are definitely taken care of in the Interior Department appropriations.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that last year the Department of the Interior appropriation bill provided for the Indians \$52 million, and that in addition there was appropriated the sum of \$3,240,000?

Mr. THYE. Last year, in the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1953, we appropriated \$51,801,000. This year we have recommended \$52,300,000. So there is an increase in that item in the 1954 appropriation.

Mr. LANGER. That would just about take care of the increase in population among the Indians from last year to this year. However, it still does not take care of all the white folks.

Mr. THYE. The item about which the Senator is now speaking would not reach the Indians to whom he has referred.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that; but in the State of North Dakota we take care of Indians in the State tuberculosis home. We do not differentiate because a man is one-fourth Indian. We do not keep him out of the tuberculosis home at Dunseith, N. Dak.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the way it should be.

Mr. LANGER. That is the way it should be.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am hoping to see the day when we will appropriate money in this bill for the benefit of every citizen in the country, whether he be an Indian or non-Indian.

Mr. LANGER. All we are asking is the same amount we had last year.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But, when we appropriate for the Indian Bureau, we provide money for work in the field of tuberculosis among the Indians. I wish the situation were different. I do not like to differentiate as between Indians and other races.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the information which the committee obtained in the hearing showed that in the beginning these mobile units had to be initiated and organized. There was the cost of procuring the unit and introducing the program, and there were other costs incidental to the initiation of the program. However, as we have advanced in the technique of mobile units, we certainly can reduce the appropriation, because the educational work has been carried on in previous years. So far as anyone afflicted with tuberculosis is concerned, he will have the benefit of care, and constant research in that field will go forward even though the item is curtailed. Much research has been done in previous years in the field of tuberculosis, in connection with the use of mobile units. I believe that some of the local municipalities have leaned on the Federal Government more heavily than they should have.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. This program has been very effective in the State of Montana. A fine job has been done there,

and the people are very fearful that the proposed reduction will do considerable damage to the program. This is one program the medical profession is supporting along with the general public. It seems to me that it would be unwise to reduce the appropriation at this time. I think it would do serious injury to the program in our State.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator from Kentucky wish to speak to this item?

Mr. COOPER. No. I wish to send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,350,000," and insert "\$1,600,000."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the amendment which I offer is directed to title I, in the item "Office of the Solicitor."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Should we not vote now on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator from North Dakota has not yet offered his amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I thought I had offered it. I shall offer it as soon as the pending amendment is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my amendment is directed to the item headed "Office of the Solicitor," under title I, on page 2. The language reads:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, \$1,350,000.

The amendment which I have submitted would increase the item for salaries and expenses in the Office of the Solicitor by the sum of \$250,000.

As the distinguished Senator from Minnesota stated in his opening explanation of the bill, the appropriation for the current fiscal year for this item is \$1,764,600. The original 1954 estimate was in the same amount. The revised estimate submitted by President Eisenhower calls for an appropriation of \$1,714,600, a reduction of \$50,000. The House reduced this amount to \$1,350,000, a reduction of \$364,600 from the estimates in President Eisenhower's budget.

I am informed that the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], which gave thorough consideration to the bill recommended to the full committee the sum of \$1,600,000. So the increase which is proposed by my amendment would restore the amount of \$1,600,000 recommended by the subcommittee which considered the bill.

If the amount fixed by the full committee is retained, it will represent a reduction in funds to the Office of the Solic-

itor of \$364,600 below the estimates of President Eisenhower. I am informed that it would reduce the number of attorneys and clerical help in the Department from 300 to 230. There would be a reduction in the number of attorneys from 176 to 128.

I should like to make it clear that I am not offering this amendment merely to assure the continuance of jobs in the Office of the Solicitor. In fact, even if my amendment is adopted it will not restore all the positions, because it will represent a cut of approximately \$114,000 from the estimates submitted in the budget of President Eisenhower.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator from Kentucky does not mind an interruption, I will say to him that this is one of the items to which I referred when I stated at the opening of my remarks on the bill that I thought we had been too conservative. Our subcommittee recommendation was for \$1,600,000. The subcommittee recommendation was not sustained by the full committee. I felt, however, that the full committee had made a mistake, and I referred to it in my remarks and stated I thought the committee had been too conservative. What the Senator from Kentucky is proposing is to reinstate the subcommittee's recommendation.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Which would be an increase of \$250,000. Speaking now as the chairman of the subcommittee, I am perfectly willing to take the amendment to conference, because I have the conviction that the amount recommended by the full committee is too conservative.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I have introduced the amendment because I am interested in making certain that the office will be able to perform its functions properly in administering and enforcing a great number of laws, vital to the country—vital to employee and employer alike. Among them are the Fair Labor Standard Act, the Bacon-Davis and Walsh-Healey Acts, designed to assure minimum wages and decent working standards; giving advice to the Federal employment and unemployment insurance services; assisting the Korean Veterans Readjustment Program; enforcing the child labor laws and other laws, which is its responsibility to enforce. As the distinguished Senator having charge of the bill has announced his support of my amendment I will not endanger my position by speaking further. I am afraid that if I did so, I might say something—I do not think I would—that might change the Senator's mind. I thank him sincerely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for the



statement he has made with reference to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] for himself and for me. I certainly hope that the Senate will agree to the amendment.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

The amendment was agreed to.

**Mr. THYE.** Mr. President, I am authorized by the committee to offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will state the amendment.

**THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** On page 16, line 6, before the period it is proposed to insert the following:

*Provided further,* That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and for each succeeding fiscal year, all land lying within the boundaries of the Boulder Canyon Project Reservation shall be considered Federal property within the meaning of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, second session; but this proviso shall not be construed as to interfere with State taxation of leasehold interests: *Provided further,* That any tax collected for school purposes on any leasehold interest within the boundaries of the Boulder City Union School District on and after July 1, 1953, shall be deducted under section 3 (g) of said act.

**Mr. McCARRAN.** Mr. President, I should like to make an explanation of the amendment which has been offered on behalf of the Senate Appropriations Committee by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who is in charge of the pending bill.

Mr. President, Boulder City, Nev., is a Federal municipality located a few miles north of Hoover Dam. Boulder City is operated by the Bureau of Reclamation and contains the headquarters of several Federal agencies which are concerned with the operation of Hoover Dam and power plants, the Lake Mead area and so forth. It is also the regional headquarters of the Bureau of Reclamation. It is a community of several thousand, and in layout is a model city. It is wholly located within the Boulder Canyon Project Reservation, and the land has been owned by the Federal Government ever since it was acquired from Mexico under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo on February 2, 1848. The Boulder City School District was created by the State of Nevada to take care of the educational needs of the citizens of Boulder City, most of whom are Federal workers. From its inception the Boulder City schools have faced a series of unique problems due to the fact that they lie wholly within a Federal reservation, cannot assess real estate taxes and so are increasingly dependent on the Federal Government for support, as their school population continues to increase.

Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to make it possible for the Boulder City schools to continue to receive Federal aid under the provisions of Public Law 874, which was approved on September 30, 1950. Under that law local school districts have received Fed-

eral aid where the impact of Federal activities has placed an undue burden on such schools. Prior to the passage of Public Law 874, the Boulder City school district, lying wholly within a Federal reservation, received a direct appropriation in the annual Department of Interior Appropriation bill. When Public Law 874 was passed, the direct appropriation was discontinued, as it was the belief that all of these cases should be taken care of under provisions of that law. Since September 1950 that has been done. Matters have been going smoothly and the Boulder City schools have been doing an excellent job. However, a few weeks ago the attorneys in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare decided that the Boulder City schools must take a very serious reduction in the amount they receive from the Federal Government. This decision that the school funds must be cut was predicated upon a new interpretation of the definition of "Federal property" contained in the act. This definition reads as follows:

**SEC. 9. (1)** The term "Federal property" means real property which is owned by the United States or is leased by the United States, and which is not subject to taxation by any State or any political subdivision of a State.

Mr. President, in Boulder City the Federal Government has entered into leases with the local residents on the ground covering their homes or businesses. The amount of acreage covered by these leaseholds amounts to approximately 674 acres out of a total of 67,200 acres in the Federal reservation, or just about 1 percent of the total. Of course, this leased land belongs to the United States and is not subject to any State tax; but a leasehold interest held by a private citizen is taxable, and Clark County has applied a school tax on the possessory interest in these leaseholds. The lawyers in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have now held that, by so doing, the county has eliminated all these leased lands from being considered in determining the entitlement of the local schools under Public Law 874. While these 674 acres constitute only about 1 percent of the total acreage in the Federal reservation, this leased property generates over one-half of the local enrollment in the schools. Thus, under this new interpretation the Boulder City schools stand to lose an estimated \$70,000 in Federal funds because of a leasehold tax which returns approximately \$2,600 per year to the county.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that the Boulder City schools are located wholly within a Federal reservation; and unless Federal help is continued, they will have to close. The majority of the children attending school have parents who are bona fide Federal employees and who work for various agencies of the Federal Government, such as the Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Mines, National Park Service, and so forth. Recognizing that this community is wholly federally owned and operated, the Congress in the past has appropriated

funds to build school facilities; and these have now been completed, and compare favorably with any in the United States. Therefore, it would be doubly disastrous if these schools were now to be forced to close because of misinterpretation of the term "Federal property" contained in Public Law 874.

Mr. President, Public Law 874 expires on June 30, 1954, and I note that the House committee has just reported an extension of the act. I am further advised that this bill carries a broadened definition of "Federal property," so as to take care of situations such as the one which has arisen at Boulder City. However, I submit, Mr. President, it is entirely possible that due to the press of last-minute business, the Congress might not enact this extension of Public Law 874. Therefore, I hope this amendment will be adopted. If by chance the bill now before the House is passed by this Congress before it adjourns, no harm will have been done, as this amendment is not in conflict in any way with the clarifying provisions in the new bill. But if by chance the Congress does not pass the new bill, then as a result of the adoption of the amendment the Boulder City schools will be able to continue to meet the educational needs of this fine community, and the children of regularly employed Federal workers will not be denied an education.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on behalf of the Senate Appropriations Committee would very simply provide that all land lying within the Boulder Canyon project reservation would be considered Federal property for the purpose of carrying out Public Law 874. It would further provide that any moneys collected for school purposes by the imposition of the local leasehold tax would be deducted from the Federal payment; that such tax may continue to be imposed; and that the amendment will not be construed so as in any way to increase the present boundaries of the Boulder Canyon project reservation. The amendment is retroactive to the beginning of the fiscal year just ended, due to the fact that the Department has stated that it will have to ask that the Boulder City school district refund all money received during that fiscal year.

Mr. President, again I wish to emphasize that unless this amendment is adopted, these schools will have to close, as there is absolutely no other source of revenue open to them. This is in no way the fault of the people of Boulder City or of the State of Nevada. It simply arises because Boulder City is a wholly owned and operated Federal installation.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will adopt this amendment.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to further amendment.



Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, in lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$9 million" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$9,500,000."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to restore to the appropriation for salaries and expenses of the National Labor Relations Board the amount of \$500,000 which was recommended by President Eisenhower and is contained in the Eisenhower budget estimate, but which was eliminated by the House of Representatives. The Senate Appropriations Committee failed to restore the \$500,000 when it reported the pending measure.

Mr. President, the elimination of these necessary funds is false economy, and in the long run will prove far more costly to the taxpayers of America than what is reported to us today as a saving. The cost of delay in the administration of the so-called Taft-Hartley Act is difficult to estimate with any degree of accuracy, but it is perfectly clear that it falls most heavily upon litigants involved in a labor-management dispute coming within the jurisdiction of the Board. When it is realized that the Board's jurisdiction has been extended to cover almost every conceivable kind of business enterprise, it is equally clear that those costs must ultimately be borne by the taxpayers of this country. There is one indisputable fact upon which both labor and management unanimously agree, and that is the absolute need for expediting the administrative processes of the National Labor Relations Board so as to avoid interminable, exhausting, and unreasonable delay incident to the processing of cases and final decision by the Board. During the 81st and 82d Congresses the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare authorized certain investigations and studies of this problem. One of the most important facts disclosed was that the average time consumed in handling and processing unfair labor practice cases, from the time of the filing of the charge to the time of the issuance of a Board decision, was 480 days, or almost 1 year and one-half. Mr. President, it should be borne in mind that this is an average figure for all unfair labor practice cases processed by the Board at that time. In far too many cases the time consumed was over 2 years. The disastrous effect of such delays upon both management and labor is too obvious to require repetition here today. But it is very apparent that delays lead to strikes, and strikes are costly to everyone—labor, management, and the general public.

It is significant that when Congress appropriated adequate funds for fiscal year 1953 to be used for the purpose of increasing the staff personnel of the Board the average time-delay factor in unfair labor-practice cases was substantially reduced from a high of the aforementioned 480 days to approximately 1 year. This record of case disposition compares favorably with that of the

Federal courts in their processing of civil cases.

Mr. President, the reduction of the administrative funds for the National Labor Relations Board is proposed at a time when the Board is making steady progress toward the elimination of unreasonable delay in its administrative processes. The reduction simply means that the services of trained and competent employees presently handling these cases will have to be terminated. However, Mr. President, the cut will go much deeper than simply the elimination of the services of certain individuals, because those destined for dismissal must, under the law, be given 30 days' notice and also must be granted their accumulated terminal leave. This means they will have to be kept on the payroll for approximately 3 months after the receipt of dismissal notices. During this time, cases which normally would be referred to these employees will become part of a vast backlog which ultimately will have to be disposed of by others, when time permits. The backlog of unrefereed cases results in what the former Chairman of the Board, Mr. Paul Herzog, referred to as "dead time," or the time lost when each case has to await assignment.

Mr. President, the National Labor Relations Board has absolutely no control whatever over the number of cases it will review. If, because of inadequate funds for continuing the services of trained personnel, there is inevitably created a backlog of cases, the Congress will begin to hear directly from both labor and management, with the result that next year we shall be forced to back down from our so-called economy stand and to appropriate even larger sums of money for the hiring of new and, in most cases, untrained personnel in order to cut down the backlog. I am reliably informed that it takes from 3 to 6 months to train new personnel to handle efficiently the processing and review of these cases. Hence, by refusing to appropriate sufficient funds we encourage delays which can result only in costly and ineffective enforcement of the Taft-Hartley Act's provisions.

Therefore, Mr. President, I most earnestly hope the Senate will adopt my amendment so we may be assured of prompt and expeditious processing of cases by the National Labor Relations Board, in order that it may maintain and, if possible, improve its present record of case disposition. If the Congress is sincere in its oft-expressed wish that the Taft-Hartley Act be fully and effectively enforced, then I may suggest that it is in the interests of sound administration of the act that the Senate restore the amount of \$500,000 as recommended by President Eisenhower.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have listened to the statement presented by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] in support of his amendment. It was the firm belief of the committee that \$9 million would be sufficient, since \$9 million was appropriated for this Board in the

1953 appropriations. We could not foresee that in this year there would be a greater load upon the Board than what it had to carry last year. For that reason, the committee recommended the same amount, \$9 million, for the fiscal year 1954. I can only say, therefore, that the committee, upon the basis of all the information which it gathered on the subject, was justified in recommending \$9 million. I regret that I must find myself opposing the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it seems to me that Mr. Paul Herzog, who was Chairman of the Board, should be in a better position to determine this question than we in the Senate. He pointed out that the backlog of cases at one time was constantly increasing; that the delays were so great that the efficiency of administration of the act was being impaired and, in addition, was becoming more costly. It seems to me that in the interest of having an efficient administration of the law, we should not hamstring the Board by refusing to provide sufficient funds with which to carry out the program.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I must say to my distinguished friend that the subcommittee, when it conducted hearings, endeavored to obtain all the facts possible; and, after we had obtained all the facts, the committee, according to its best judgment, recommended an appropriation of \$9 million.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the record not show that the administration claims it will be necessary to fire 100 employees if the \$500,000 is not restored? That is in the record. If the Senator will look at the record, I think he will find it.

Mr. THYE. The record shows, of course, that the revised budget recommendation was \$9,500,000; and that is what was requested. But the best judgment of the committee, after studying all the facts, was that \$9 million should be allowed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.
Anderson	Ellender	Johnson, Tex.
Barrett	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Beall	Flanders	Kennedy
Bennett	George	Kerr
Bricker	Gillette	Kilgore
Bush	Goldwater	Knowland
Butler, Md.	Gore	Kuchel
Butler, Nebr.	Green	Langer
Byrd	Griswold	Lehman
Capehart	Hayden	Long
Carlson	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Case	Hennings	Malone
Chavez	Hickenlooper	Mansfield
Clements	Hill	Martin
Cooper	Hoey	Maybank
Cordon	Holland	McCarran
Dirksen	Humphrey	McCarthy
Douglas	Jackson	McClellan
Duff	Jenner	Millikin



Monroney	Robertson	Symington
Morse	Russell	Thye
Mundt	Saltonstall	Tobey
Murray	Schoeppel	Watkins
Neely	Smathers	Welker
Pastore	Smith, Maine	Wiley
Payne	Smith, N. J.	Williams
Potter	Sparkman	Young
Purtell	Stennis	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVEs] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana on page 36, lines 10 and 11, of the bill, to change the figure from "\$9,000,000" to "\$9,500,000." [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it; the "noes" have it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair had announced the result of the vote.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is the Chair correct in stating that a Senator cannot ask for a division after the result of a vote has been announced?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a division on this question, because a division was asked for before the absence of a quorum was suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to divide.

On a division, Mr. MURRAY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call up my amendment designated "7-6-53-A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "\$700,000" and insert "\$800,000."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the amendment which I have called up would increase the amount appropriated for the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards from \$700,000 to \$800,000 for the next fiscal year. The amount which I have suggested in my amendment is

\$38,000 less than the appropriation provided for the fiscal year 1953. It is \$128,000 less than the appropriation requested by President Eisenhower in his revised budget estimate, and it is \$198,000 less than the original budget estimate.

The committee figure of \$700,000 is \$228,000 less than the amount the President requested in his revised budget. The \$700,000 committee figure for the Bureau of Labor Standards is \$298,000 less than the Truman budget.

My amendment proposes to increase the appropriation from \$700,000 to \$800,000, which would still leave the funds available for the Bureau of Labor Standards \$128,000 less than the budget figure requested by the President of the United States.

It is my understanding that the subcommittee originally recommended \$800,000, the same figure which I now propose. I deeply regret that the subcommittee's recommendation was overruled by the full committee, which cut the amount for the Bureau of Labor Standards to \$700,000, which is \$228,000 less than the amount asked for by the President.

The proposed cut is more than a cut in the fat; it is a cut into what I believe to be the lean meat of essential services now being provided by the Department of Labor in the effort to maintain the high labor standards authorized by the law of the Nation. It is a cut contrary to the President's program, as stated in his budget message, and is certainly contrary to the intent of the laws which the Department of Labor is asked to administer.

Many segments in the United States depend upon the Bureau of Labor Standards for current information on labor laws.

I might digress to say, in connection with what the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] pointed out, that information on labor legislation supplied to respective State labor offices is very important to the maintenance of effective peaceful labor-management relations. I do not believe the situation is in any way improved by having labor-legislation information withheld from employer-employee groups throughout the country.

Mr. THYE rose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct. The subcommittee did recommend \$800,000, but, after giving further consideration to the entire question, the final decision of the full committee on this item is as follows:

The committee recommends an increase of \$76,000 over the House allowance, but an amount \$228,000 under the revised estimate.

The committee directs the Bureau to allocate to its safety program not less than the amount budgeted in the revised estimate, \$425,572. The committee had been advised that under the House allowance this program would be reduced by \$200,000, a reduction of 46.92 percent. It is the consensus of the committee that this safety program is the major justification for this Bureau.

The committee concurs with the House recommendation that no funds are allowed for increased activity in the field of migratory labor.

The committee also recommends the inclusion of the following language after the word "exhibits": "and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards."

That was the action of the full committee. They gave much consideration to this very item in the appropriation bill, and after careful study the full committee proposed \$700,000, and it was included as a committee recommendation. I believe the program can be administered with the \$700,000 now recommended in the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota and compliment him and his subcommittee for taking what I deem to be considered and reasonable action in approving the sum of \$800,000, which my amendment calls for. As the Senator has pointed out, the full committee reduced that amount by \$100,000.

The House reduced President Eisenhower's request by more than \$300,000 for one bureau in the Department of Labor. I am very much intrigued with the kind of mathematics involved in reference to the safety division and industrial safety program of the Bureau of Labor Standards, which, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, is one of the most vital and important functions. The safety program involves almost one-half the budget request for the Bureau. Yet the Senate committee has reduced the Bureau's funds by one-fourth. In spite of that, its report, as the senior Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, "directs the Bureau to allocate to its safety program not less than the amount budgeted in the revised estimate, \$425,572."

What does this mean? It means that when the President sent to Congress the budget for this particular bureau, with a figure of \$925,000 incorporated, he said that \$572,000 out of that \$925,425 should be devoted to promoting industrial safety. This was after the budget had been reduced from the original Truman budget estimates, and after the economy cuts had been made. So what has been the result of the advice from the President? The House of Representatives reduced the amount to \$624,000, which would, of course, literally obliterate the programs.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations restored \$76,000, which brought the amount up to \$700,000. The fact is that the industrial safety program will be jeopardized unless the funds which are necessary are appropriated. If we allocate the full \$425,000 to industrial safety, we literally wreck the other programs.

Let me state what some of the other programs are. As I pointed out previously, the States receive information as to standards, administrative procedures, and labor measures which have been tried by the Federal Government and the States. There has in recent years been developed an admirable system of Federal-State agreements in labor-law administration, which has eliminated much duplication in inspection, and has established harmonious cooperative relationships between Federal and State departments of labor.



In Congress there is a movement to place more authority in the States in the field of labor law. I submit that if that is done, and Congress reduces the funds which are necessary to keep the 48 States fully informed as to the effects of labor laws, and their relationship to the Federal Government, we are going to have a madhouse of labor legislation, administrative duplication, and administrative difficulties.

Actually the budget has saved a good deal of money by eliminating duplication and in removing the necessity for Federal inspection, simply because States have had the benefit of cooperative efforts among themselves as a result of the exchange of information.

Another important function of the Bureau of Labor Standards is carried out in its program affecting child labor and youth employment. The proposed cut would eliminate 7 out of the present 18 persons engaged in the program of administering the Fair Labor Standards Act as it applies to child labor. Actually only a short time ago there were as many as 50 employees in that section. The Bureau of Labor Standards had a staff of 50 persons for the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Law as it applied to child labor. That number has been reduced to 18. If the appropriation recommended by the committee is agreed to, the number will be cut to 11. In other words, 11 officials will remain in a bureau which seeks to aid 160 million people in the 48 States in the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act, so far as child labor in the United States is concerned.

I think that would make a mockery of the law. There is no use having on the books a law under which employers can be prosecuted, unless there can be adequate personnel for the enforcement of the fair labor standards.

Another point I wish to call to the attention of the Senate, in view of certain exposés which have been made as a result of racketeering in the United States is that under the Taft-Hartley Act the Department of Labor has the responsibility to obtain specific financial and organizational information from labor organizations that desire to use the services of the National Labor Relations Board.

The Union Registration Division of the Bureau of Labor Standards was formed to carry out that function. In other words, before a union can get certification from the National Labor Relations Board, it must be certified, and it must have its organizational structure and its union financial certificate or financial statement approved and registered by the Union Registration Division of the Bureau of Labor Standards. To carry out this task, Congress appropriated in 1948, which was the year of the economy-minded 80th Congress, approximately \$95,000. The request for this year by the administration is \$28,355. That is what the President asked for. The staff has been reduced from 34 to 7 as a result of simplifying methods and procedures which the Bureau has been adopting. Further to reduce the staff, as would be required under the appropriation cut recommended by the Appropriations

Committee, would literally cripple or do away with this Division. Congress either ought to repeal the union financial registration part of the Taft-Hartley Act, or provide sufficient funds and personnel with which to get the job done.

One further point, and I shall call for a vote. If we are to have a program of industrial safety, if we are to have a Bureau of Labor Standards, I think the least we can do is to give it enough to operate upon. I am not asking in this amendment for the Truman budget figure, which was substantially \$938,000. I am not asking even for the Eisenhower budget figure, which was approximately \$928,000. I am asking that we restore the figure to \$800,000, which was recommended by the subcommittee, which heard all the testimony and evidence. Even when that is done, we shall have a very weak Bureau of Labor Standards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before a vote is taken on my amendment, I remind the Senate that my amendment proposes merely to restore the amount recommended by the subcommittee. It would still leave the amount \$138,000 below the Eisenhower recommendation, and would still provide for a substantial cut in the appropriation for those who feel that that is necessary. I recommend \$800,000 instead of \$700,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the amendment offered by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

The gap between promises and performances of the present administration is growing wider and wider.

Contrary to assurances from the President during the campaign that he intended building up and strengthening the Department of Labor, disabling cuts in operating funds for the Department are contained in the appropriation bill as passed by the House, and are continued to a great degree in the bill now before us as reported out by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Under date of March 4, 1953, President Eisenhower wrote a letter to Secretary of Labor Martin P. Durkin, reading, in part, as follows:

"I commend the Department of Labor for its useful services and contributions to the Nation over the last 40 years. In the assistance, research, statistical, and law-enforcement operations of the Department, you are building up the strength of the whole economy. As I said in my state of the Union message last month, the administration intends to strengthen and improve your services to the worker and to the whole national community. \* \* \*

In government, as in other walks of life, we must go forward. We cannot stand still without stagnating. Your Department, I am confident, is marching ahead and helping lead our people on to better, happier, and more prosperous lives."

The Republican leadership of the Congress is apparently unaware of this administration attitude. It apparently believes, instead in open season on the Labor Department. In the Department of Labor's appropriations as reported by the House Appropriations and passed by the House last month, slashes amounted to some \$30 million below the administration's revised budget estimates, and nearly \$40 million below the original 1954 estimates. Unfortunately, our Senate Appropriations Committee has restored but a very small amount of these drastic cuts. The Senate bill before us is still \$22,055,600 under the administration's own estimates, and \$33,958,000 under the original Truman budget.

These cuts are not "fat" being removed. They are deep and disabling cuts into the lean meat of public services performed by the Department of Labor, in direct violation of the administration's pledge to build up the Department and its services.

How long are the American people expected to be fooled by the lip service from high places in the administration, if the majority party in Congress continues to repudiate in performance the promises contained in statements of high purpose from the White House?

I urge that these reductions be examined very carefully, with the realization that they go far beyond the economy squeeze already put on the Department's budget requests by the President's Budget Director.

In addition to crippling cuts in operating funds for the Department, without adequate justification the appropriation bill cuts down the grants to States, earmarked for the purpose of administering the State unemployment insurance and public employment office programs, by almost \$16½ million.

This seems to have been done, as far as I can tell, on the fallacious belief that there will be no soft spots in our economy, no industrial layoffs, no workers moving from one job to another. In addition, by restricting the money available to pay the State employees in the employment and unemployment insurance offices, we appear to be forbidding any increase in their salaries to catch up with the cost of living. In my opinion, the State grants should be restored as a measure of economic insurance.

The economic skies still appear bright today. Employment may be at its highest, and unemployment lowest. But there are some people who see threatening clouds on the economic horizon. The unemployment insurance and public employment systems are important factors in stabilizing our economy, and taking up slack in local and seasonal slumps. It is shortsighted to weaken this system.

The cuts in the Department of Labor's very small operating budget have even more serious implications.

This smallest of Cabinet Departments administers several labor laws, including the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, and the Davis-Bacon Prevailing Wage Act for public-construction projects. It handles the Federal part of the unemployment insurance and public employment office programs. One of its bureaus is charged with the promotion of better industrial-safety programs, through training and assistance to the State labor commissions. The Bureau of Apprenticeships has a broad program of promoting management and labor cooperation in the training of more skilled workers all over the country, which is of the utmost importance to our whole technology.



Hence, it is very serious that the cuts made strike most heavily at the most vital programs.

The Secretary's own office provides the whole Department with overall policy planning and central administrative and budget services. This operation was cut by one-fourth. A cut of this magnitude cannot be absorbed by a speed up of the remaining workers, or assigning them additional duties. It means that some of the office's coordination of policy and operations, and some of the central services rendered to the operating bureaus, will be discontinued. That work will not be done, and the public served by the Department will simply not receive the action or the information requested.

The Solicitor's office was also cut by one-fourth, the result being that the Department loses some of its specially trained and experienced lawyers. This means that many of the violators of the Federal labor laws cannot be brought into court. It means that studies of legislation, and legal help requested by other Departments, Congressmen, and businessmen, cannot be furnished. It means that the wage determinations required by contractors under the Davis-Bacon law as a preliminary to defense building jobs cannot be made as expeditiously.

The 22-percent cut in the Wage Hour and Public Contracts Division is perhaps the most damaging cut of all.

The cut will reduce this bureau to its lowest personnel strength since Congress enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938, establishing a wage floor, overtime for over 40 hours, and banning oppressive child labor. This law protects more than 22 million workers engaged in interstate commerce against sweatshop, cut wage, and unfair employers. The staff of this bureau investigates complaints of violations, and does a preventive job of enforcement by informing employers of their responsibility under the law. Its investigators in the past have inspected annually only about 4 percent of the establishments covered by the law. If the cut stands, this figure will be reduced drastically. That will mean violations will go unpunished and uncorrected, and that workers will lose millions of dollars in wages and overtime due them under the Federal laws.

Businessmen and farmers both will be hurt by the depletion and elimination of Labor Department services which they have been using constantly for many years. My own State's farmers depend upon the Farm Labor Service, operating through the Bureau of Employment Security and the State employment offices, for large numbers of migratory and seasonal workers for cultivation and harvest of their crops. A program of the Bureau of Labor Standards, to provide voluntary help to local communities looking to improvement of housing, education, and other facilities for the 1 million or more migratory workers of the country, is destroyed by the reductions in this bill.

Businessmen are hurt by the reduction in the size and efficiency of the Employment Security Bureau, by the cutback in funds for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and especially by the heavy cut in the Bureau of Labor Standards which directs the industrial safety program.

Because Labor Department officials rightly protested that House cuts to the Bureau of Labor Statistics would virtually eliminate collection of figures on housing starts and other construction statistics, and cuts to the Bureau of Labor Standards would mean slashing the safety program almost 50 percent, the Senate committee has come up with some hocus pocus whereby the appropriations are still slashed, yet the Labor Department is ordered not to cut the housing statistics and to maintain the safety program at the same level.

The safety program, for example, originally amounted to nearly half the budget requests for the Bureau of Labor Standards. Yet the Senate committee has reduced the Bureau's funds by one-fourth—and still asks that the safety program be maintained at the same level. I just don't believe it can be done.

This safety program has been successful in reducing the 1952 accident rate to a record low, even though job accidents still run at the appalling figure of 2 million a year. The program provides special instruction and technical help to the safety inspectors who work for the State labor commissions. It is a service which the States request. Its effectiveness has been demonstrated many times in many States by actual experience and figures demonstrating a reduction in the number of injured workmen. We should keep on trying to cut down this annual toll of human life and suffering instead of ruthlessly applying the "economy whip" at the expense of human resources.

The Department of Labor serves all parts of our Nation.

Despite its smallness it touches importantly vast numbers of people in every segment of our population and economic life—business, labor, farmers, universities, civic groups, children, minority groups, builders, home owners—everyone. All of us will be hurt by this proposed heavy and disproportionate cut in its operating funds, undermining programs and services the Congress has voted into effect by crippling the Department and preventing proper enforcement of our laws for the protection of working men and women.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have an amendment which would restore the appropriation for the Children's Bureau to the amount requested by the administration. The senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] join me in offering the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 28, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,450,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$1,500,000."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the amount requested for salaries and expenses for the Children's Bureau in the Eisenhower budget is \$1,550,000. The amount was cut to \$1,500,000 by the House and was cut an additional \$50,000 by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

The appropriation for last year was \$1,550,000, which is the amount requested in the Eisenhower budget for this year. If the reduction is permitted to stand, it will mean a cutting down of the work of the Children's Bureau. I am sure everyone agrees the work of that Bureau has been very much worth while. It has been an important bureau. It was established under the administration of William Howard Taft and has been under the leadership of Miss Lenroot and Dr. Martha Elliot most of the time since its establishment. I do not know how long they have been connected with it, but I am sure it is most of the time that the Bureau has been in existence.

The Bureau has already been cut down since 1947 from 339 employees to 234. To let the figure stand as now written in the bill would mean that the work of the Bureau would be cut much more and its work curtailed. I shall not go into

detail as to what the work of the Bureau is.

This morning the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry very properly voted to approve a bill which would provide loans for the livestock people of the United States. The total amount of such loans will undoubtedly reach \$100 million. In the very near future the Appropriations Committee will be asked to make the money available for those loans. It seems to me that asking for \$100,000 for the children of our country is not asking too much. I hope the amendment will be approved.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in my introductory remarks on the pending bill I stated the items on which I thought the committee had been too conservative. The item in connection with which the Senator from Vermont offers an amendment to provide necessary funds for the Children's Bureau is one of the items on which I stated we had been too conservative. The work of the Children's Bureau is most constructive and should be adequately supported. Therefore I am very happy to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on behalf of himself, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN subsequently said: Mr. President, a short time ago I offered an amendment to restore the amount in the child labor appropriation requested by President Eisenhower. I made a correct reference on the floor, but I find I have made an error in the amendment which I offered, and I ask unanimous consent to change my amendment so that it will properly fit the remarks which I made on the floor, and increase the amount of the appropriation to \$1,550,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is requesting unanimous consent to conform his amendment to the figure stated in his remarks on the floor; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct. On reading a statement by the wire service I found I had made a mistake in the amendment itself.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, we have just had a vote by which the Senate rejected the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], to increase the amount of the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board. I have taken up with the members of the Board the situation in which they find themselves. While the Senate has turned down the amendment to increase the appropriation to \$9,500,000, I ask that the bill be amended to provide \$9,250,000. My amendment comes in on page 36, line 10. It proposes



to insert \$9,250,000 in lieu of the \$9 million now provided in the pending bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will state the amendment.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** On page 36, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "\$9,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$9,250,000."

Mr. **SMITH** of New Jersey. I offer the amendment because, as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am aware of a problem confronting the National Labor Relations Board. It is the problem of the backlog of work. I realize that the amount of \$9,500,000 was considered as being too high by the subcommittee, and the Senate voted against the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. **MURRAY**]. I feel, however, it is very important not to let the cases pile up in the Board, because to do so interferes with the successful operation of management-labor relations.

While the National Labor Relations Board is not under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, nevertheless, I consider it to be the committee's responsibility to do everything we can to help the Board function effectively.

Therefore I ask that the Senate provide \$9,250,000 for the work of the Labor Relations Board, as the next suggestion in line with the amendment previously offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. **MURRAY**].

Mr. **MURRAY.** Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from New Jersey has offered his amendment. If sufficient funds are not provided to carry on the program, much will be lost. There will be great delay in the processing of the cases, which will mean an added expense.

Mr. **SMITH** of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Montana. I ask the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. **THYE**] whether he will take the amendment to conference?

Mr. **THYE.** Mr. President, I must inform the Senator from New Jersey that it was the best judgment of the committee that \$9 million should be the sum to be allowed.

Now the Chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has indicated a fear, as the Senator from Montana did previously, that the board will not be able to carry on its work efficiently unless it receives more than \$9 million. With not only two members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but with the chairman of that committee also, asking a second time that we increase the amount, this time by \$250,000 after we have rejected an amendment to increase the amount by \$500,000, I will agree to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. **SMITH** of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. **MORSE.** Mr. President, I am glad to hear the Senator from Minnesota say that he is agreeable to taking the amendment to conference. It ought to go to conference. The money will be wisely expended, I believe, by the National Labor Relations Board.

We might as well face the fact that more money is needed if the Board is to assume a certain responsibility which

I think we should give to it by law. I refer to amending the law so that the Board will assume jurisdiction over cases charging communism within unions. Apparently that is a no man's land in the law today.

As conditions now are an employer who in good faith says he is not going to negotiate with a union because he is satisfied the union is Communist-dominated cannot get any relief from the Board because the courts have ruled that the law as presently written does not give the Board jurisdiction.

I am in favor of supplying the Board with sufficient funds so that it may assume jurisdiction in cases charging Communist dominated unions, once we amend the law to give it such jurisdiction. That is why I dissented from a report on Communist influence in a few labor unions, which report was issued by the subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations, when I was a Member of the labor committee. In fact, I was quite surprised that a majority of my colleagues went along with the majority report on that issue. We have failed to provide any procedure to protect an American employer who in good faith says, "I do not want to negotiate with this union because it is Communist-dominated." Where is he going to go for relief?

It is perfectly obvious that he should go to the National Labor Relations Board, and the Board should be given such jurisdiction.

That is why I take this opportunity to reinforce the position I took as a dissenter in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, when, to my complete surprise, that committee went along with the notion that the National Labor Relations Board should not be the tribunal which should assume jurisdiction over the issue of communism in labor unions. If the Board is not given jurisdiction over that issue, what agency will assume such jurisdiction? We are just playing ducks and drakes on this issue, Mr. President.

We should stop "kidding" ourselves about it. We should give the National Labor Relations Board the necessary funds and staff, so that it can get to the bottom of the question of communism in American trade unions. Not many American unions are Communist dominated. But when a union is Communist dominated, it should not have the benefit of the services of the National Labor Relations Board, but should be told, "You will not receive any service from this Board until you clean out communism in your union."

So, Mr. President, I am glad the amendment adding \$250,000 to the appropriation will be taken to conference.

Mr. **THYE.** Mr. President, I wonder whether the question may be put on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, which I said I would agree to take to conference.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. **SMITH**].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **BUSH.** Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. On page 5, in

line 2, the bill as reported carries the figure "\$197,110,000." That is an increase of nearly \$10 million over the amount voted by the House of Representatives. The subcommittee of which the Senator from Minnesota is chairman reported a larger amount, namely, \$202,920,000. Subsequently, the full committee voted to reduce the amount to \$197,110,000.

I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that the commissioner of labor and others in my State are very much concerned about the reduction voted by the House of Representatives, and they are a little worried even about the amount voted by the Senate committee.

I wish to say further to the Senator from Minnesota that if an insufficient amount is allowed it will have a serious effect upon the labor department in my State, with respect to the collection of delinquent taxes, for instance, which very much more than pay for the small group who are engaged in that work. Last year 26 persons were employed in that particular activity, which cost the State \$88,400, but they collected \$524,000 in delinquent taxes, and they made possible additional tax assessments of \$202,000. Certainly it is a good investment when, by spending \$88,000, \$700,000 is obtained.

Does the Senator from Minnesota feel that the committee can be absolutely firm on this particular figure in conference?

Mr. **THYE.** As we review the entire question, we find in the publication the Labor Market and Employment Security, issued by the Department of Labor under Secretary Durkin, the following statement:

Unemployment dropped by 276,000 from April's 1.6 million to a phenomenal low for the month of May of 1.3 million, or 296,000 below May 1952 and 303,000 below May 1951.

That indicates that there is full employment. However, \$10 million of this appropriation is placed in a contingent fund. It is impounded, in other words. If there should be a greater demand upon the Department, because of unemployment, and so forth, over and above what has been anticipated, of course, the Department could draw upon the contingent fund.

It is my belief that the contingent fund is larger than is necessary.

I believe it should be \$5 million, and that the other \$5 million should be placed in the general administrative fund. In that manner the overall figure would not be changed, but \$5 million would be added to the administrative fund and \$5 million would be held as a contingent fund. I would be willing to accept such an amendment because I believe that would be proper. In view of present trends, I do not believe a contingent fund of more than \$5 million will be needed.

So I would support such an amendment, namely, on page 5, in line 2, to make such a reduction in the item of \$10 million in connection with which the following statement appears in the bill on page 5: "of which 10 million shall be available only to the extent that the Secretary finds necessary to meet increased



costs of administration resulting from changes in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or salary costs over those upon which the State's basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Columbia) was based, which increased costs of administration cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments."

If we thus reduce the contingent fund to \$5 million and increase the administrative fund by \$5 million, I believe we shall be providing ample funds for administration, and shall still be safeguarding ourselves against an unforeseen load.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 5, in line 2, strike out "\$10 million" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5 million."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to direct the attention of the Senate to the appropriation for the Food and Drug Administration and to the figure "\$5,200,000," appearing on page 12, in line 11.

The appropriation for the Food and Drug Administration has been cut \$400,000 below the 1953 figure, and \$463,000 below the original 1954 estimate. The Senate committee has recommended \$200,000 more than the House has voted for this item.

On the White House TV show, Mrs. Hobby announced that her Department was about to recommend legislation to improve food and drug inspection laws. The proposed legislation, which has not been introduced, so far as I know, would permit inspectors to enter premises at reasonable hours without the owners' permission. Last year the Supreme Court in the Cardiff case held that the present act requires such permission. Mrs. Hobby represented her proposal as a major step forward in social legislation.

Mr. President, I think there is great need for us to exercise vigilance in protecting the health of the American people through the administration of the pure food and drug law.

What is the value of improved inspection laws, if funds for inspection are cut? I desire to cite as an example the situation in my own State; and my comments apply to any other State where a similar situation exists.

The Portland subdistrict office, established some 10 years ago, has been operating for at least the last 5 years with a staff of 3 inspectors, 3 chemists; 1 laboratory helper, and 1 clerk. Food and Drug advise that unless funds are restored, there will be one less inspector and the chemical analysis required will be done in the Seattle office, whose personnel will also be cut.

A major task of the Portland office has been to carry on inspections in the immense cannery industry in the Portland area. During the packing season, it has been necessary to have inspectors come down from Seattle to supplement the Portland staff. Under proposed cuts, such outside assistance would be improb-

able and the local force would be doing even less than it has done in years past.

The question arises whether this is economy. Certainly, it subjects the consuming public to greater hazards. It is also unfair to the great majority of responsible canners who wish to maintain high standards of sanitation and purity. Where Federal inspection is inadequate, less responsible producers will feel more free to cut corners to reduce expenses. This places the responsible business community at a competitive disadvantage.

The Oregon office will save some \$6,000 by the discharge of a laboratory helper and a clerical employee. The consolidation of chemical functions may produce some additional slight savings, which would be offset by the disruption of present practices and the cost of transfer of materials, records, and the like.

I use the Oregon office only as an example of the kind of appropriation cut which is supposedly designed to effect economies but which, in effect, amounts to partial repeal of existing law. In addition, the cost to the Nation in products of lower standards and possible impairment of the health of many citizens may very well offset the relatively few dollars which are being saved. Apparently we must be careful to make sure that the health of the Nation is not expendable.

Therefore, Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 12, line 11, to strike out "\$5,200,000" and insert "\$5,400,000," an increase of \$200,000.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee to take the amendment to conference, to see what can be worked out with the House. If I am correctly advised, as I believe I am, the saving which is sought will be at the expense of the administration of the inspection laws of the country, and we can take judicial notice of the fact that if that is an accurate statement, we are saving at the expense of the American people, in that we are endangering their health. In my opinion we cannot justify taking that risk. I am talking about insurance; I am talking about an insurance premium which the American taxpayer ought to be willing to pay to make certain that there is adequate and efficient administration of the inspection laws. I submit the amendment, and respectfully ask that it be taken to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$5,200,200" and insert "\$5,400,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the revised budget estimate for this item was \$5,648,000. The House bill called for \$5,000,000. The Senate Appropriations Committee increased that by \$200,000. We definitely had a feeling that the increase over the House figure would probably be as much as we would be able to support in conference or would be able to agree to in conference. There was some supporting evidence for the budget recommendation of \$5,648,000.

If I were to object to the increase proposed by the Senator from Oregon in the amount of \$200,000, I would not stand on too firm ground, since both the original and the revised budget estimate called for a greater sum even than the total that would be provided in the bill, with the proposed \$5,400,000, which includes the increase proposed by the Senator from Oregon in his amendment. The Senate bill would then provide \$5,400,000, whereas the budget recommendation was \$5,648,000. So I will agree to take the amendment of the Senator from Oregon to conference, because in so doing I do not believe I shall be going contrary to the wishes of the Senate committee on this question. The question, to be perfectly frank, was rather one of whether we could get the House to agree to a greater sum than \$5,200,000.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Minnesota has been very reasonable and I appreciate his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in my opening remarks I referred to the fact that I thought the committee had been too conservative with the Office of Education, as well as with the Department of Labor. For that reason, and inasmuch as President Eisenhower sent a letter in which he referred specifically to items in the appropriation bill which he thought should be increased, notably, one item which he thought should be increased by \$426,000, and another item which he thought should be increased by \$151,000. I move on page 15, line 17, to strike out "\$2,500,000", in lieu thereof to insert "\$2,926,000." That would increase the item in the appropriation bill for the Office of Education, salaries and expenses, by \$426,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send the amendment to the desk?

Mr. THYE. I am pleased to do so.

Mr. President, it is unusual for a subcommittee chairman to offer an amendment to increase an appropriation, but in this instance the question has been very thoroughly studied. The Office of Education has been reorganized, and it has had more time within which to study the overall question in the interim between the time the committee concluded its hearings and today, when we are considering the bill itself. Inasmuch as the Office of Education has been reorganized, and has conducted a thorough study of all of its administrative problems, and inasmuch as both the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, and the President of the United States have referred to this item and have expressed the hope that the appropriation might be increased, I am offering the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$2,926,000."



The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have a second amendment, which is, on page 31, line 7, strike out "\$1,075,000" and insert "\$1,226,000." This is for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Secretary. It will increase the appropriations under the bill by \$151,000. I could repeat in regard to this item the statement I made when the previous item was under consideration, since the recommendation was contained in the letter of the President, and since Mrs. Hobby likewise had approved it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,075,000" and insert "\$1,226,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very happy to support both amendments offered by the Senator from Minnesota, because I think it is self-evident that we cannot maintain the educational needs of American boys and girls without adequate funds for the purpose. We owe it to those boys and girls to appropriate the necessary funds. In my judgment, the compromise the Senator from Minnesota has worked out—and it is a compromise; it is not all the Department would like—is fair and equitable. It is certainly one which should receive our consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a telegram which I have received from William G. Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 6, 1953.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

National Education Association convention at Miami Beach, Fla., July 1, telegraphed plea to President Eisenhower for help in getting the Senate restoration of \$426,000 House cut in Budget Bureau Director Dodge's request for \$2,926,000 for Office of Education salaries and expenses. Through Attorney General Brownell, the President sent the following message to the convention July 3:

"This cut would damage the essential services of the Office of Education which are provided by that office for the benefit of State and local school services. Therefore, President Eisenhower, with solid Cabinet backing, will use every effort to see that the cut in appropriation for the Office of Education is restored in full."

In view of the President's statement, we hope that move will be made on Senate floor Tuesday, July 7, to make full restoration of the \$426,000 House cut. National Education Association urges your support of the \$2,926,000 for Office of Education salaries and expenses as originally requested by President Eisenhower through Secretary Hobby.

WILLIAM G. CARR,  
Executive Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 2, it is proposed to insert, in lieu of the figure "\$6,250,000", the figure "\$7,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, my amendment would increase the figure recommended by the committee for the Wage and Hour Division by \$750,000. That Division is charged with the enforcing of the Federal wage and hour law, including the minimum 75-cents-an-hour provision, with the 40-hour week, and also the Federal child-labor laws.

The funds for this work have always been inadequate and have been very greatly diminished in recent years. For example, in the appropriation for 1952, the amount provided was over \$8½ million. The appropriation for the fiscal year just past was \$7,639,000, a drop of \$910,000.

The House reduced the figure in the pending bill for 1954 to \$6 million. The Senate committee raised it by \$250,000, or to a total of \$6,250,000. It is still \$1,400,000 less than the amount for the past year and over \$2¼ million below the 1952 appropriation. It is more than a million dollars below the Eisenhower budget for the fiscal year 1954. Even my amendment would result in a reduction of \$300,000 below the Eisenhower budget.

In view of the fact that the Congress of the United States and the people of the country have shown that they want wages to be a minimum of 75 cents an hour, that they want a 40-hour week, that they want effective child-labor legislation, we should provide sufficient funds for inspection and enforcement. In the years just passed, the Wage and Hour Division has had enough money to inspect only approximately 6 percent of the establishments covered by this law.

I may say that it finds a very large percentage of violations. In the 41,000 inspections made in fiscal 1952, approximately 58 percent of the cases inspected show violations of the wage-and-hour law. There is a very substantial percentage of violations of the child-labor law, particularly in the case of farm child labor, children working on big commercial farms and plantations.

If we adopt the committee's recommendation of \$6,250,000, we shall still further reduce the possibility of making inspections, so that instead of inspecting 6 percent of the establishments involved, the Department may be able to inspect only a little over 4 percent, and the enforcement of the 75-cent-an-hour wage and the 16-year minimum age of labor by children will be seriously weakened.

We should provide at least a modicum of the funds necessary to enforce these laws.

I hope very much that, since the chairman of the subcommittee, the very distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], seems to be in a gen-

erous mood today, he will accept my amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to be in a generous mood. The subcommittee made a very thorough study, and some of the generosity shown today was based upon the fact that the subcommittee had not been fully supported in its views when the full committee gave the matter its consideration. Therefore, Mr. President, the attitude of the chairman of the subcommittee may have been weakness rather than generosity.

As to this particular item I most regretfully state that the subcommittee, although it was very firm in its view and went into it at considerable length in trying to study and determine what should be the action of the Appropriations Committee, finally arrived at the amount which has been stated. It is true that the amount recommended is below the budget recommendation, but it is above what the House allowed. Therefore, inasmuch as we did increase the House recommendation by \$250,000, and we are so close to the revised budget recommendation, I feel that we would not be justified in accepting the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the amount recommended by the committee is over a million dollars below the amount requested by the President, who recommended \$7,339,000? This committee is proposing to appropriate only \$6,250,000, which is virtually \$1,100,000 less than the amount recommended by the President. As a matter of fact, the Senate cut is one of the largest which has been experienced by any administrative agency of the Government.

I assure the Senator from Minnesota that I do not believe he wants to sabotage the child-labor provisions of the law or the 75-cents-an-hour basic wage law, but the amount recommended by the committee will seriously cripple these enforcement measures.

Mr. THYE. It is not a question of what we want; it is a question of what the facts are as we have found them to be. The committee feels that adequate enforcement can be brought about with the funds recommended. There is no limit to the amount the agency might desire. Human nature being what it is, it would be perfectly natural for them to say, "There is a field here which we ought to investigate." They do investigate many fields and they render an excellent public service. They safeguard the public and safeguard child labor from abuses. But the best judgment which the committee was able to exercise, after lengthy hearings and study of the overall question, was that the amount recommended would be ample to carry on the program in the manner proposed by the Congress in the legislation heretofore passed.

We certainly increased the sum recommended by the House, but I think we shall find that the House will not agree even to the \$6,250,000 figure we have recommended.



Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that there are two ways of killing the prevention of child labor; two ways of killing social reform measures? One is to refuse to pass any legislation in the first place; the other is to pass such legislation, but not to provide funds for its enforcement. I have much more respect for those who will openly oppose legislation and kill it openly with the sword than I have for those who while giving lip service to the principle will deny funds for adequate enforcement and hence kill the cause with a kiss.

The record shows that the basic wage-and-hour laws are being violated in a large percentage of cases. In 58 percent of the establishments visited in the fiscal year of 1952 there were violations of the wage-and-hour law. In one-eighth of the factories and establishments inspected there were violations of the child-labor law. In 80 percent of the farms visited there were violations of provisions of law relative to child labor.

So there is real need for enforcement. Yet the committee is proposing to cut funds by \$1,400,000 below the appropriation for this past year, and by almost \$1,100,000 below the amount recommended by President Eisenhower. The committee's figure would necessitate the closing of 23 field offices and reduce inspections by 20 to 25 percent. Even with the increase provided in my amendment, the inspections which the Wage and Hour Division could make would be reduced 10 to 12 percent below last year's level.

I do not think I can be accused of being a wasteful spender, but I do not wish to see laws gutted, and people who cannot defend themselves, primarily women and children, deprived of protection through the gross failure of Congress to appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	McClellan
Anderson	Hayden	Millikin
Barrett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Beall	Hennings	Morse
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bush	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Payne
Byrd	Jackson	Potter
Capehart	Jenner	Purtell
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Cooper	Kerr	Smathers
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kuchel	Sparkman
Duff	Langer	Stennis
Dworschak	Lehman	Symington
Ellender	Long	Thye
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tobey
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
George	Mansfield	Welker
Gillette	Martin	Wiley
Goldwater	Maybank	Williams
Gore	McCarran	Young
Green	McCarthy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May the amendment be stated by the clerk for the information of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 2, in lieu of "\$6,250,000," it is proposed to insert "\$7,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT SERVICE—SUBSTITUTE ORIGINAL BUDGET—WORLD WAR I, II, AND KOREAN VETERANS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 4, line 9, to substitute the original budget recommendation of \$1,100,000 for the figure of \$981,000, for the Veterans' Employment Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send the amendment to the desk?

Mr. MALONE. I have no written amendment. My amendment is to substitute \$1,100,000 for \$981,000, on page 4, line 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "\$981,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,100,000."

#### VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT DISTRICTS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am entirely familiar with the Veterans' Employment Service only in my own State and the western district. The western district or region includes Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, Idaho, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Colorado. The remaining States of the Union are divided into five additional districts.

#### SUCCESSIVE REDUCTION IN VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

I point out that in 1948 there were 738 employees in this service; in 1949 the number was cut to 410; in 1950 to 265; in 1951–52, to 165. This proposal would reduce the number to 145, in the 48 States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. President, the Veterans' Employment Service is more important at this moment than it has ever been in the history of this Nation. We have about 3½ million holdovers from World War I. We have about 16 million from World War II; we now have about 1,898,000 Korean war veterans who have been discharged—a total of 20,088,000 veterans.

#### RESOLUTION—AMERICAN LEGION—OCTOBER 1950

In that connection I should like to read into the RECORD at this point a resolution by the American Legion:

Whereas the American Legion foresaw the need for, and designed the provisions under title IV, Public Law 346, (GI bill of rights) of the 78th Congress, passed June 22, 1944; and

Whereas this enactment created the Veterans' Employment Service (a Federal agency) for the purpose of cooperating with and assisting the United States Employment Service to the end that "there shall be an effective job counseling and employment placement service for veterans and that to this end policies shall be promulgated and administered so as to provide for them a maximum of job opportunity in the field of gainful employment"; and

Whereas the total position strength of the Veterans' Employment Service in the Nation has been reduced from 738 in 1948 to 410 in 1949, and to 265 during 1950, and that of the staff in Montana from a total of 7 to 3; and

Whereas such reductions in staff have seriously jeopardized veterans' representation, protection, and aid in the field of gainful employment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Legion in national convention assembled at Los Angeles, Calif., October 9–12, 1950, earnestly and vigorously recommend and request restoration of the Veterans' Employment Service staff requirements sufficiently adequate to comply with the purpose, intent, and provisions of title IV, Public Law 346.

#### PITIFULLY SMALL ORGANIZATION FOR THE JOB

Mr. President, there are only 162 positions in the entire area just named, the 48 States and the possessions. That is the total number of positions in the entire Veterans' Employment Service. Before the recent cut there were 152 field positions. Fifty-two were veterans' employment representatives, 35 assistant veterans' employment representatives, and there were 59 clerical workers. That represents the total for the entire United States—a pitifully small organization for the workload.

#### KOREAN VETERANS ON WAY BACK

I point out to the Senate today that with the Korean veterans on their way back the problem is growing worse by the day. The purpose of this service is to try to help veterans get jobs. The healthy veterans who come back mentally fit and physically fit do not require much help.

However, those who are mentally upset are in a different category. I have watched this situation since World War I—that was my war—through World War II, and thus far in world war III, which, regardless of Mr. Truman or anyone else, it is world war III.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an outline of factual information regarding the Veterans' Employment Service.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Veterans' Employment Service activities are based on the statutory requirements of the Wagner-Peyser Act, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. It is the responsibility of the Veterans' Employment Service and its representatives in all the States and Territories to exercise functional supervision of the services to veterans through local offices of the State employment security agencies to insure that an effective job counseling and employment placement service is maintained for veterans. The State veterans' employment representatives must insure that the policies of the Secretary of Labor and the policies and procedures of the Bureau of Employment Security on special services for veterans are carried out by the State agen-



cies. The successful rehabilitation of disabled veterans, the reabsorption into the labor force of large numbers of reservists who have been inducted into the Armed Forces for the second time in less than a decade, the most advantageous use of the training benefits available to veterans, the number of veterans who will draw unemployment compensation, and the overall readjustment of veterans as a group will depend largely on the manner in which these policies and procedures are carried out.

Since 1947 the Veterans' Employment Service has experienced reductions in its staff from 795 positions to 163 as of December 31, 1952. Since July 1951 the staffing pattern of the Service fell from 253 to 163. During this same period the monthly discharge rate of the Armed Forces has been steadily increasing as has the workload in local employment service offices. The present appropriation action of the Senate and House subcommittees allows \$981,000 for the operation of the Service for the fiscal year 1953-54. This will reduce the positions allocated to the Service from 163 to 145. The following is a breakdown:

	1952-53 positions	1953-54 positions
Field.....	153	135
Veterans' employment representatives.....	52	52
Assistant veterans' em- ployment representa- tives.....	36	20
Staff field representatives.....	6	0
Clerical.....	59	53
Departmental.....	10	10

As of May 1953 there were 20,880,000 living veterans of the wars of the United States of which 1,898,000 were veterans of the services since the start of the Korean campaign. The employment counseling and job finding assistance required by this significant segment of the working population can best be illustrated by the number of veterans served by local offices in the past fiscal years. From July 1951 through June of 1952, 1,349,352 veterans registered for employment. From July 1952 through April of 1953, 1,314,804 had registered. From July 1951 through June of 1952, 1,454,437 veterans were placed by the cooperative efforts of the Veterans' Employment Service, the State Employment Services, and the United States Employment Service. From July 1952 through April of 1953, 1,351,905 veterans were placed. The last few months' operations indicate that there will be increases in the number filing new applications, the number requiring counseling and testing services and the resulting demands for increased placement activities.

The casualties from the Korean campaign and the servicemen disabled in training and other accidents will continue to require special attention on the part of all employment service personnel, particularly the Veterans' Employment Representatives. The successful rehabilitation of disabled veterans requires close cooperation on the part of the training and placement agencies and demands constant vigilance to insure the necessary interagency referral, training in occupations in which there is a reasonable expectancy of a job after training and prompt placement in positions for which they have been trained.

It is generally recognized that a period of military service initially places a worker at a disadvantage in the labor market due to one or more reasons directly traceable to his service such as lack of civilian work experience, older than the normal entrance age for apprenticeships or on-job training, inability to utilize military skills in civilian occupations, existence of a service-connected disability, etc. As a result it is necessary to

stimulate an interest and a sympathetic understanding on the part of employers and the public in this problem. After nearly 10 years of war and national emergencies, it is becoming increasingly more difficult to maintain this interest and to persuade employers to give veterans special consideration. Consequently, the Veterans' Employment Service and its field representatives must devote more time and effort to this activity.

Approximately 1 million servicemen will be released from the Armed Forces during the current fiscal year and each of the next several years. At the present time servicemen are being separated in significant numbers from approximately 120 different military installations and 63 military and naval hospitals. The Veterans' Employment Service with its representatives in every State and Territory must assume the primary responsibility for working out with the commanding officers of these military installations and hospitals the necessary procedures to insure that discharges are informed of all their rights, benefits, and services which are administered by the Department of Labor. State Veterans' Employment Representatives must see that competent employment service personnel are assigned to separation centers and military hospitals whenever the workload warrants such assignment and that military counselors at all other installations have the necessary materials and knowledge to provide this information to discharges. This will require State Veterans' Employment Representatives to visit all military installations within their respective States at regular intervals.

The staff field representatives of the Veterans' Employment Service have rendered invaluable aid to the employment services of the Nation and to the many Federal, State, and local government agencies and organizations interested in the employment of veterans. They were men of long experience in the affairs of veterans. They were able to counsel both specifically and in general terms individuals and organizations with an accuracy that could be gained only by reason of their experience and operating facility. Their services were in constant demand not only by their operating duties but upon requests from veteran organizations, regionwide and Statewide groups in both management and labor fields. There was a niche which in my opinion is more needed today than ever before. It was not their primary duty to supervise but rather to augment and aid the capable efforts of the individual State veterans' employment representatives and State directors of the Employment Service.

#### WHEN A MAN NEEDS A FRIEND

Mr. MALONE. When a man comes back from war mentally upset because of the tremendous bombardment to which he has been subjected, he is just as bad off as though he were physically injured, and maybe worse.

What he needs is a little friendly advice. His chief asset is the veterans' employment organization within his State.

There he gets friendly service. If it is believed that training would help him, those in the veterans' employment organization know how and it is their job to refer him to the Veterans' Administration for such training as that organization affords.

If they can get him a job and assist him to settle down, and then counsel him in what to him may be real emergencies he has an opportunity to settle down, keep his job, become a taxpayer and raise a family—otherwise he could well end up as a Veterans' Bureau pen-

sioner and be accused as many are accused of being "goldbrickers"—when as a matter of fact it may well be that it is Congress who is at fault.

If this Veterans' Employment Service is cut to the point where it is no longer effective and it has been cut almost to that point previously—the situation could well be very serious.

#### CUTS THE FIELD REPRESENTATIVES

I point out that this cut takes away 6 field representatives. I am not familiar with the work of the other representatives. I am familiar with the work of representatives in the 10 Western States. The number of representatives in the State employment services is very small, as I have just described. In the State of Nevada we have 1 man and 2 girls for the entire State, a State 600 miles long and 400 miles wide, with probably 20,000 or 25,000 veterans.

#### RECOMMENDATION FOR ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES IGNORED

As a matter of fact the recommendation was for 16 additional employees made necessary since the job situation is tightening, with the veterans coming back in increasing numbers from Korea.

#### NO TIME TO ECONOMIZE ON UNEMPLOYED VETERANS

I point out Mr. President that this is no time to economize at the expense of unemployed and wounded veterans; especially when we send \$6 billion in cash and materials into foreign countries for no good reason at all—with additional billions expended in offshore purchase and repair contracts, with its attendant graft and waste.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Nevada that no cut is involved in the Veterans' Placement Service, because the bill provides that \$981,000 shall be available for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV. I will say to the Senator from Nevada that the services of the six field men to which he has referred were terminated some weeks ago. Regardless of the amount appropriated, it would have no effect on the staff field supervisors, because their services have been terminated.

I will be perfectly frank in saying that I would not deny funds to provide proper veterans' services in the various States, but I will say with equal frankness that the men who were roving across the country from one State to another were not in any sense aiding in placing veterans. I have checked on that matter very carefully, and I believe the Bureau of the Budget had recognized the same situation to exist. They took it into consideration in making their recommendations. I was informed by the Secretary that the reorganization plan had contemplated the termination of the services of the field supervisors before the committee ever gave consideration to the 1954 budget recommendations.

I believe the bill appropriates every dime the Secretary has recommended for this particular service. In fact, we in-



creased the amount over that appropriated by the House by \$125,000. Therefore I cannot help but speak in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Let me read from the committee report. This is the best opinion of the committee:

The committee recommends an increase of \$125,000 over the House allowance, but an amount \$210,000 under the revised estimate.

The Bureau will be enabled with the restoration here recommended to allocate the full amount of its budget request for the collection and interpretation of labor market information and for the farm placement service, and the balance of the increase to assistance in maintaining public employment services.

Mr. President, I believe the department will render the service to which the Senator from Nevada has referred, but the work of the six field supervisors was terminated some weeks ago, and regardless of what we appropriate, they will not be reinstated unless the policy of the department is changed.

#### REDUCED BUDGET NOT VOLUNTARY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I thoroughly disagree with the Senator from Minnesota, for whom I have the highest regard. I have just discussed the matter with the Labor Department and have been informed that the recommendation from that source was for 16 new employees to assist in carrying the much-increased Korean load.

I assure you that the reduced budget was not voluntary.

#### A FINE RECORD WITH THE LOAD INCREASING

Let me say Mr. President, that there are now on file 365,000, as of this date, active applications from veterans for jobs.

In 1951 1,454,000 veterans were placed in jobs. The number of applications was 1,349,362.

From July 1952 to April 1953 the new applications numbered 1,314,804. In the same period there were placed in jobs 1,351,905 veterans.

Mr. President, many of those men will continue to be restored to a sound place in society, with the help of this service. There is no question of the need for it.

I say to you that it is not the time to cut the Veterans' Employment Service, which has been carried all these years through the peak of employment, now that the employment situation is tightening. The President is trying to end the war in Korea and the veterans will be coming back in increasing numbers and the trained, experienced Veterans' Employment Service is the only real understanding sympathetic organization to which they can turn.

#### RETURNING VETERANS NEED FRIENDLY RECEPTION

Many of these boys are mentally upset. Many Senators on this floor have served in time of war and they know what it means to face the danger and the terrific explosions with the attendant nervous tensions that are a part of any war.

Many of them may outwardly have nothing wrong with them, except that they are mentally upset. They are suffering from mental instability—as well

as bodily fatigue. If they can be met upon their return by friendly people in the Veterans' Employment Service, they may settle down to a job and escape the sanitarium.

In the Veterans' Employment Service they have been and will be greeted by friendly people who will say to them, "Do not worry, we will place you. Take your time. We will try to get you a job you can handle."

#### IT CAN MAKE THE DIFFERENCE

In that way they will have a chance to return as citizens and taxpayers of a community, and become family men as though the war had not interrupted their lives.

Otherwise there is every opportunity for them to drop unnoticed into the fast-moving streams of the generally employed and unemployed and just not be able to pull the load in competition with those who either did not go to war or who have already dug in and oriented themselves in the economic structure of the community and Nation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota with respect to an amendment in line 9, page 28, regarding the Children's Bureau. I have received communications from a number of communities expressing concern that the appropriation is being cut a little too low. I understand the amount has been increased on the floor. I am glad it has been raised. I wonder whether the chairman of the subcommittee could tell me to what amount it was raised.

Mr. THYE. The amendment as originally offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] proposed to increase the amount by \$50,000. That amendment prevailed. Subsequently, the amendment was corrected on the request of the Senator from Vermont so that the Children's Bureau will receive an increase of \$100,000 over the amount in the committee bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With reference to the Bureau of Public Assistance, that figure remains unchanged, as I understand.

Mr. THYE. That remains unchanged.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question with reference to page 3, line 25, the Bureau of Apprenticeship. My question is, Was the \$3,400,000, which is the amount the House appropriated, the revised budget estimate of the administration?

Mr. THYE. The revised estimate was \$3,324,000. There has been no amendment offered to the appropriation recommended by the Senate committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). An amendment is now pending. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, since there has been a lull in the proceedings, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk restate the amendment I have offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will restate the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "\$981,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,100,000." BUDGET RECOMMENDATION MINIMIZES EFFICIENT OPERATION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have moved to have the Senate restore the amount of the budget recommendation, which is the very minimum to operate the Veterans' Employment Service efficiently.

The Veterans' Employment Service has been systematically reduced by Congress during the last 4 years to a dangerous extent, especially in view of the fact that we are trying to end the war and the fact that the Korean war veterans are returning to the United States in increasing numbers.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not wish to argue the question, but I point out that the committee gave considerable study to the overall item. The committee's recommendation is included in the bill. It represents the best judgment of the committee, after much study and consideration, and is supported by the Secretary, and is in line with the revised budget recommendation, not the Truman budget.

#### MR. FAULKNER AND THE REDUCED BUDGET

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this situation came about because Mr. Perry Faulkner, a veteran and one of the finest men I know, who is head of the service, was practically instructed at the hearing to reduce the original request.

I intend to put the case of the unemployed veteran before the Senate—and while I happen to be working for the Government at this time, it is in a quite different capacity.

The only folks who can discharge me are 3,000 miles from Washington, D. C., and I do not believe that they approve of such tactics either.

#### SENATE SHOULD DECIDE—WRONG TIME TO CUT VETERANS' SERVICE

So I should like to have the Senate itself decide this question, considering that the veterans service has had its funds cut in half twice during the last 5 years by Congress, and that the veterans are now returning from the Korean war in increasing numbers. If there is an armistice in Korea, the rest of the troops may return to the United States. They will undoubtedly be replaced as new men can be sent abroad.

Certainly this is the wrong time to reduce the appropriation for the Veterans' Employment Service, for when the veterans return to the United States, they rely upon this service for help in getting jobs and settling down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada. [Putting the question.] The yeas seem to have it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.



Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "\$21,850,000" and insert "\$23,000,000."

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, this amendment will restore to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation the funds which have been requested by the Eisenhower Bureau of the Budget. The amendment will restore the amount which was voted by the House of Representatives, but which was reduced to the extent of \$1,150,000 by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, in connection with this amendment, I find myself in a strange position. Inasmuch as I have constantly advocated economy in Government, I find now that I must ask for an increase in an appropriation item.

Mr. President, those who believe in and advocate economy in Government of course will have to support the amendment of the committee; and those who believe in conservation of our human resources will want to support the amendment I have offered. The amount recommended by President Eisenhower, after careful study, is to provide for a program in which the new Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is vitally interested.

When the House Appropriations Committee considered this item, it voted to reduce it to \$20,600,000. However, by a bipartisan effort on the part of the Members of the House of Representatives, and by a vote of nearly 2 to 1, the House restored the item to the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget, namely, \$23 million.

The \$23 million, as recommended by the administration, is the amount necessary to maintain the program and to carry it on in the various States at the present level. The cost of providing rehabilitation service has continued to rise, as has almost every other item with which Congress has to deal.

The practical effect of the reduction proposed by the subcommittee is as follows: The reduction of \$1,150,000 will result in having approximately 3,200 fewer persons rehabilitated in the year 1954, as compared with the number who were rehabilitated in 1953. In other words, fewer persons will receive the benefit of rehabilitation service.

The United States Government will lose \$800,000 in income taxes which would have been paid in the first year by the 3,200 persons who would have been rehabilitated. That money will be lost to the Federal Treasury.

The Nation will lose more than 6 million man-hours of production and \$6 million of wages, which these 3,200 persons would have earned. These figures have been substantiated by the Bureau of the Budget and by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The reduction proposed by the committee will leave on public assistance rolls approximately 700 persons, who otherwise would have been removed from these rolls as a result of the work of the rehabilitation service. In other words,

700 persons will draw approximately \$500,000 annually in public assistance.

Those facts and figures offer eloquent testimony to the effect that the cut recommended by the committee, instead of resulting in a gain to the Federal Government, will actually result in a net loss, since the public assistance costs made necessary by the reduction will be greater than the actual amount of the reduction itself. In other words, the reduction of \$1,150,000 will cause a loss of \$800,000 in income taxes which otherwise would be paid into the Federal Treasury, and will cause a loss of 6 million man-hours of production and \$6 million in the wages the 3,200 persons would have earned. The proposed reduction, is retained, will keep on the public-assistance rolls 700 persons who otherwise would be removed from the rolls if the larger fund were made available.

Mr. President, if for no other reason than the purely selfish one of economy, it is necessary that the amendment calling for a restoration of the fund be adopted.

Frequently we have heard great concern expressed by many Members of the Senate regarding conservation of our great natural resources. I favor good, sound conservation policies; but, Mr. President, no conservation is more important than conservation of our human resources; and in no program of the Federal Government is there better conservation of our human resources than in the program carried on by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

For instance, that Office is of very great assistance to those who have been crippled by accident or disease or at birth. The funds provided for this agency are used for the training of such persons, with the result that, rather than being wards of the States, they will be active members of our society and will take their full role in the productive capacity of the Nation, will pay taxes into the Federal Treasury, and will have all the dignity our great Nation affords its individual citizens.

Thus, Mr. President, the cut recommended by the Appropriations Committee will not result in economy. On the contrary, it represents a spendthrift policy.

Therefore, Mr. President, I sincerely hope the committee will see fit to accept my amendment.

In the committee report I notice that one of the reasons stated for the committee's recommended reduction of \$1,500,000 in the item for this program is that the committee felt the States themselves could contribute more to the program. Mr. President, by Federal statute the Federal Government assumes responsibility for the entire administrative costs and for the counseling costs, and the States assume responsibility, on a 50-50 matching basis, for certain other services. If we wish the States to assume greater responsibility in connection with the program, we should amend the statute under which this service is provided. But the Federal Government should not assume this responsibility and then attempt to chastise the States because they do not provide the funds the Federal

Government said it would provide under the enacting legislation. So, Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senate will see the wisdom of restoring the funds as proposed in the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. POTTER. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may state to the Senator from Michigan that he has performed a very great service to the Senate in bringing out the great economic as well as the human importance of the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation. If the record is examined, I am sure it will be found that the funds which are placed in rehabilitation programs actually pay tremendous economic dividends, as well as large dividends in the form of human welfare. The Senator from Michigan has pointed out that cutting the item in question represents a spendthrift policy rather than a sound economic policy, because without Federal vocational rehabilitation, as the Senate must know, county after county, State after State will have a tremendous burden of public assistance for those who are handicapped. The vocational rehabilitation program has restored fine citizens to useful and gainful employment and production, has made them self-sustaining, and, in fact, has fulfilled some of the most vital needs of American industry.

I recall, for example, that some of the programs involve delicate-instrument making which has to do with a kind of industrial capacity which is hard to obtain in this country. The vocational rehabilitation program has been responsible for the training of more specialists in delicate instrument manufacturing and other delicate work than any other single program which the Government supports. The Defense Department, in connection with another appropriation bill, praised the industrial rehabilitation service for having provided much-needed manpower from among those who were handicapped who were being given training in order that they might fill a need in particular areas of American industry.

The Senator from Michigan has indeed a very good amendment. Not only should the amendment be adopted, but, as the Senator pointed out, it was agreed in the House overwhelmingly that the amount of the Budget figures should be restored by a bipartisan vote on the part of Members of the House who know what this program provides, and who will surely support it.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his comment. I may say that for every dollar spent on this program \$10 is returned to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that the program to which he has referred is very important. I have received many inquiries from my State indicating alarm over the cut in this ap-



propriation and the resulting injurious effects it would have upon the rehabilitation program.

I know that in other more densely populated centers the percentage of handicapped persons is increasing quite noticeably, and in those centers there is a strong demand for the continuation undiminished of this program, but even in my State of Kansas, where it is viewed better from an impartial standpoint, there are many who are alarmed by this cut.

They point out that Congress is very generous in the appropriation of funds for use in other countries of the world, indeed, that we have stood at the front with respect to such matters in other parts of the world. They emphasize that it would be false economy for us to ignore the vital need for vocational rehabilitation to which the Senator has adverted so eloquently on the floor of the Senate. I feel constrained to support the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, and I shall do so.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the comments made by the Senator from Kansas are very timely. Our Government is spending more money on vocational rehabilitation in foreign countries than it is spending on a similar program in the United States of America.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. POTTER. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly commend the very forceful presentation of this matter by the Senator from Michigan. As I understand, his amendment proposes only an additional \$1,150,000, which will restore the House figure.

Mr. POTTER. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. If we are to reduce the figures for this year, or for any other year, should we not at least give one year's notice in advance, in order that the States or counties, if they are going to have to assume all the cost, may at least have an opportunity to make preparation for so doing?

Mr. POTTER. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Without such notice, it would be impossible for the program to continue without interruption and without reduction.

Mr. POTTER. If this cut is allowed to stand, many of the States which through their legislatures, will have appropriated funds for matching purposes will find that the contribution on the part of the Federal Government has not been provided. In respect to some of the items, by act of Congress the funds are to be provided entirely by the Federal Government, and in such instances the State will either have to pay for the services as to which the Federal Government has said, "We will take care of these, ourselves," or they will have to return the money to their own treasuries.

Mr. STENNIS. Merely from the dollars-and-cents standpoint, the returns from the vocational-rehabilitation program are so great that the Senator from Mississippi feels certain that anyone who really acquaints himself with all the facts will be tremendously impressed, and will strongly support the Senator's amendment.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, in his excellent presentation of the subject covered by the amendment, not only as an important humanitarian consideration, but also a great economic program. The figures I have show that more than 2 million people in this country are so badly handicapped as to be unemployable, but if given proper rehabilitation, they would become self-sustaining, self-supporting, and taxpaying citizens, producing in their own right.

Furthermore, I am informed that to this number of 2 million there are added each year 250,000 people who become disabled because of industrial accidents, automobile accidents, or other misfortunes. So there is an increasing total, of whom, under present programs, and even with the amount requested by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, it will be possible to rehabilitate through public, Federal, and State sources only 65,000 of the 2 million, plus the 250,000 each year who are being added to that number. All types of private agencies and private foundations are rehabilitating only about 35,000.

So, even with the proposed restoration of funds, which has been so ably advocated by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, we shall still be losing ground in our effort to restore the self-respect, self-esteem, and ability to support our Government in time of crisis, both with their hands and with their minds and also with their taxes, those who constitute this valuable reservoir of people who today are unemployable because no one paid enough attention to their rehabilitation.

On top of that, Mr. President, I should like to say that medical science each year is discovering new ways of restoring to useful life and productive capacity people who heretofore have been considered completely and totally and permanently disabled. This is true of the paraplegics. Some veterans are suffering from injuries which are taken care of by the Government itself; but there will be other cases in civilian life that cannot be taken care of in that manner.

As medical science makes new steps in its progress, I think it is pathetic that the Congress of the United States and this great Government of ours, cannot find sufficient funds to enable it to help carry this program forward on an advancing front, rather than on a retreating front.

I should hate to look into the faces of the 3,200 persons who will be arbitrarily cut off from a useful life of production and happiness because the Senate of the United States would not restore the funds for which the President of the United States has asked, which the House of Representatives has provided, and which I believe a majority on both sides of the aisle in the Senate would like to see restored.

I should like to read to the Senate the amounts paid out to disabled persons:

One hundred and forty million dollars is paid annually to 140,000 disabled breadwinners of 370,000 dependent children; \$92 million is paid annually to 159,000 permanently and totally disabled adults; \$63 million is paid annually to 98,000 needy blind; \$100 million is paid annually for general assistance to 180,000 disabled men and women.

There we have a list, Mr. President, totaling in excess of \$300 million, yet we are asking that only \$23 million be spent to help to trim down the costs which will go on and on for 30 or 50 years, whereas money spent to rehabilitate disabled persons not only takes them off the list for permanent relief but adds to those who will help to carry the load for other disabled persons who have not been rehabilitated.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his eloquent comments regarding this amendment. I should like to emphasize a little bit what the Senator has stated. We are merely scratching the surface in the great conservation program which we are discussing today, and even if the full amount were provided, we would be only holding our own. So, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Senate will see fit to adopt my amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am happy to associate myself with the Senator from Michigan in this very worthy amendment.

Recently a survey, which was made in four counties in Oklahoma by the joint staffs of the Department of Public Welfare and the Vocational Rehabilitation Division, developed some very interesting facts. According to that survey, 1,000 families in the State were receiving aid for dependent children because the heads of the families were disabled. In each case the family could be removed from the status of having dependent children on the rolls if vocational rehabilitation were made available to the head of the family. On the average, these families have been on public-assistance rolls for a period of approximately 3 years, and it is estimated that if \$500,000 had been expended in rehabilitation 3 years ago, it would have resulted in the saving of approximately \$5 million.

As I recall, there are approximately 5 dependent children, on the average, for each 2 disabled heads of families. Assistance to the one who is disabled, making him a contributor to society instead of a recipient, a producer instead of one who is only a consumer, is of the utmost importance, but of equal importance is what it does for the children to have the confidence and the morale-building effect of knowing that their father, instead of being a disabled person, receiving aid and having to accept it for his dependent children, has become one who can hold his head up and his shoulders back among those who support their families and are upstanding, producing American citizens.

I think we should unhesitatingly support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan.



Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will he Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to join with other Senators on this side of the aisle in favoring the important amendment offered by the junior Senator from Michigan, and I wish to commend him for coming to the aid of a program the value of which should be apparent to all Members of the Senate.

I understand that the House of Representatives, disagreeing with its committee, restored the full amount recommended by both President Truman and President Eisenhower. I sincerely hope this Senate will do the same.

Mr. President, everyone coming, as I do, from a State in which mining, one of the most hazardous of all occupations, plays such an important role, knows how desirable, how essential, and how valuable a strong program of vocational rehabilitation can be. But it should be equally obvious to everyone who has ever shown concern for a fellow man stricken by accident or disease and forced suddenly to learn a wholly new way of living and of working, or to become miserably dependent on others. If this were a program which called for an outlay of millions and promised not a penny in return, I would nonetheless insist that we appropriate for it every dollar that could conceivably be used effectively. Our humanitarian instincts, our sense of human decency, and our recognition of the fact that it is only through the grace of God that any one of us here may have so far escaped the need for rehabilitation, should in themselves prompt us to vote the full appropriation without a moment's hesitation. But if there are those who feel that they are obligated to be hard-boiled and to think in terms of economy rather than humanity when we are considering budgets and appropriations, then I insist that they too should vote the full amount requested by the President. For if there ever was a program which returned to the taxpayer more than he has put into it, it is this program of vocational rehabilitation. Even the most penurious and flint-hearted observed must admit that when we spend a few dollars to help a man reestablish himself as a productive member of society; as a wage-earner or an independent businessman instead of a relief-recipient; as a taxpayer instead of a tax-consumer, we are money ahead. The record proves it.

I find the committee's explanation of why it wants to cut this program unacceptable, or, at the very least, ill-timed. It may well be that the States should be doing a great deal more in this field than they now are. I think they should. But if this Republican Congress thinks it can justify putting off any consideration of its pledge to expand social security and other programs until long drawn out studies of Federal and State relationships in the tax field are completed, then certainly it can put aside the temptation to cut this program until those same studies are completed.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the senior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the able and distinguished junior Senator from Michigan in support of the restoration of funds for vocational rehabilitation. Along with many others, I have always felt that this is a sound and worthwhile program and that it is, in a very real sense, an investment rather than an expenditure. The returns on the investment can be calculated not only in the salvaging of human lives but in terms of the ultimate reduction of public relief rolls and a return of income to our National Treasury from once helpless and disheartened men and women who, through vocational rehabilitation assistance, are able to become self-supporting, taxpaying citizens.

I should like to quote just a few sentences from several of the letters that have come to me urging support of this program.

From Kansas City I received the following:

We heartily endorse the Congress' program of reduction in governmental spending, but we feel that a cut in this particular program will mean increased cost to the Government because there will be a smaller number of people rehabilitated and these others will, in turn, have to be supported through direct relief or other tax measures. Expenditures for vocational rehabilitation are nonrecurring costs, and the recipients, in turn, become tax producing, and for that reason we feel such a proposed cut will defeat the purpose of the economy.

From Jefferson City, Mo., comes the following:

It is extremely important to the handicapped of Missouri that the full amount requested in the budget be allowed to vocational rehabilitation. Any substantial cut in the amount requested will mean that services cannot be extended to 271 blind persons who were awaiting service on March 31, 1953, in the State of Missouri. Vocational rehabilitation is self-liquidating, as handicapped people who are restored to useful employment return to the State and Federal Government in taxes many times the amount that is spent on their rehabilitation.

From St. Louis, Mo., come the following comments:

\* We work very closely with the office of vocational rehabilitation in both the State of Missouri and the State of Illinois. We train a large number of handicapped people for each of these organizations and I know how careful they are with the funds they have, in making them stretch and do the largest job possible. I also know of the hundreds of handicapped, people that need the services of these agencies, both in Illinois and Missouri, and have to be turned down because of lack of funds. \* \* \* If we continue to cut the allocations for the office of rehabilitation, we will be adding more handicapped people onto the public aid, which is expensive in dollars and cents, but even more expensive in the cost to human personalities. When people want to become self-supporting individuals, we should give them the chance to get the training that is necessary so that they can quit being tax consumers and can start becoming tax contributors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a few of the letters and telegrams which stress

the need for restoration of the funds for vocational rehabilitation, in line with the budget recommendations of the President.

There being no objection, the letters and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., July 5, 1953.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOM: I urge your full support of appropriations for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation coming up for vote today. Casting aside all humanitarian and social implications of this program, I know of no expenditure by the Government which pays such direct returns to the Government by converting disabled persons, many of whom are on public assistance, into employed, tax-paying citizens. Many thanks.

HOWARD A. RUSK, M. D.

HANNIBAL, MO., June 30, 1953.

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,

Washington, D. C.:

The vocational rehabilitation bill, H. R. 5246, is now before the United States Senate. We need the appropriation as designed by the House bill. Will you give this bill your earnest consideration?

Dr. D. F. GILLOOLY.

KANSAS CITY, MO., June 29, 1953.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

We have just been informed that the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation has been cut in the Senate Appropriations Committee. We earnestly hope that you can help restore this to the original appropriation and refer you to our letter of May 26 outlining why we feel this bill of vital importance not only to the disabled but to our economy.

HOMER E. PARIS,

President, Rehabilitation Institute.

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., June 29, 1953.

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Rehabilitation funds to States being cut 5 percent. An amendment being offered to restore this cut back to original recommendation of \$23 million. Would appreciate your support in this matter. Thanks.

MARY KEOWN,

State of Missouri Department of Education.

HANNIBAL, MO., June 30, 1953.

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,

Washington, D. C.:

House bill 5246 relative to vocational rehabilitation is now before the United States Senate. This bill carries the appropriation needed for rehabilitation services. Will you give your earnest consideration to the bill as presented by the House?

B. L. MURPHY.

THE REHABILITATION INSTITUTE,

Kansas City, Mo., May 26, 1953.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: With a great deal of concern we learn that the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation has been recommended for a cut of some \$2,400,000 from the proposed budget figure and some \$600,000 from the previous appropriation.

As a nonprofit agency providing services through a rehabilitation center, we have worked closely with the Vocational Rehabilitation Division in both Kansas and Missouri and know how much the service means to the welfare of these States. We heartily endorse



the Congress' program of reduction in governmental spending, but we feel that a cut in this particular program will mean increased cost to the Government because there will be a smaller number of people rehabilitated and these others will in turn have to be supported through direct relief or other tax measures. Expenditures for vocational rehabilitation are nonrecurring costs and the recipients in turn become tax-producing, and for that reason we feel such a proposed cut will defeat the purpose of the economy.

It is necessary to depend on vocational rehabilitation to provide physical restoration and vocational training not possible through any other source, and at the present time we can cite disabled persons who cannot be served in Missouri until after July 1 because funds have been exhausted for this year. With a backlog of cases like that, new patients referred through 1954 may not be served because the funds have already been allotted to these old cases.

In order to point up the seriousness of the problem both socially and economically we would like to quote Dr. Howard Rusk, one of the nationally known authorities in the field of rehabilitation, who says that there are now some 28 million disabled persons in the United States and we are adding by disease and accident from 400,000 to 800,000 a year. Unless an all-out program of rehabilitation is carried on, by 1980 every able-bodied person will be supporting 1 chronically ill, 1 seriously disabled, and 1 aged person either through taxes or other means. This is a staggering picture, but not an impossible one to solve if both the State and Federal Governments, together with many private agencies such as ours, work together.

The Federal Office of Vocational Rehabilitation has given leadership to the States, and many local centers have been organized with their guidance and a limitation of funds will hamper the development of local programs that will in time lighten the load on the Federal level. Therefore we feel very much that, if anything, appropriations should be increased rather than decreased for a program that in the long run pays for itself.

We have brought this information to your attention because we wanted you to know how important the Board of Directors of the Rehabilitation Institute feels the work of vocational rehabilitation is to this State and to the country as a whole. We earnestly hope that you will give this program serious study and add your assistance, if you feel the program warrants your support. We will appreciate hearing your views.

Very sincerely,

HOMER E. PARIS,  
President.

GOODWILL INDUSTRIES,  
St. Louis, Mo., May 28, 1953.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: I read in the daily paper with considerable alarm the notice that considerable criticism had been heaped on the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and that the budget for that organization had been cut very materially below the figure President Eisenhower had set.

As you know, our organization is a private welfare organization in the field of rehabilitation and this last year had over 500 handicapped people come to our plant, received work and training, and over 300 of these are holding down self-supporting jobs in regular industry.

We have rather a remarkable record in our organization that for every dollar given to us we have been able to pay out enough wages to handicapped people while they were working for us so the withholding tax we took out for Uncle Sam amounted to \$1.20. When we consider the amount that is earned by the individual in regular industry after his rehabilitation, it means that Uncle Sam

gets back in withholding tax nearly \$30 for every dollar we receive in donations.

During the current 2 years, our Goodwill Industries in Kansas City and St. Louis will spend more money in wages and training for handicapped people than the combined Federal and State grants for the State of Missouri.

I tell you this not to boast as to how much we are doing, but to bring to your attention the inadequacy of the present appropriation that is being allowed for rehabilitation services.

We work very closely with the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation in both the State of Missouri and the State of Illinois. We train a large number of handicapped people for each of these organizations and I know how careful they are with the funds they have, in making them stretch and do the largest job possible. I also know of the hundreds of handicapped people that need the services of these agencies both in Illinois and Missouri and have to be turned down because of lack of funds.

One very simple example is: There are a tremendous number of people being graduated from Koch Hospital in St. Louis. As they leave the hospital, they are arrested cases of TB and many of these folks, when placed on a job, fail. I believe national figures show that only 23 percent are successful in their first job, something like 53 percent are successful on their second job, and about 87 percent are successful on their third job. We have been trying to work out a system whereby these folks could be brought to Goodwill Industries and be given a 30- to 60-day work-hardening program that would get their habits changed from those of a hospital patient to an employee and would place self-confidence back in them again. Everyone sees the need for the program and wants to go ahead with it, but with the limited funds available, it has been impossible. As a result, these people are not only failing to become self-supporting citizens, but are going through all the discouragement and heartbreak that goes along with getting a job and getting fired from it, knowing you are a failure.

The cost in our State of keeping a person on relief is approximately \$750 a year. The cost of rehabilitation runs approximately \$500. There are thousands of people on our relief rolls today that, if given the opportunity for proper rehabilitation, could become self-supporting individuals and could be contributing to the Treasury of the United States, rather than drawing from it.

If we continue to cut the allocations for the Office of Rehabilitation, we will be adding more handicapped people on to the public aid, which is expensive in dollars and cents, but even more expensive in the cost to human personalities. When people want to become self-supporting individuals, we should give them the chance to get the training that is necessary so that they can quit being tax consumers and can start becoming tax contributors.

I hope you will do all in your power to see that this action is reversed and that the amount allocated to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is returned to the figure recommended by President Eisenhower.

On behalf of all the handicapped people here in our State, I urge you to do everything in your power to bring about this action.

R. C. ADAIR,  
Executive Director.

DIVISION OF WELFARE,  
STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC  
HEALTH AND WELFARE,  
Jefferson City, Mo., May 18, 1953.  
Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOM: The Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1954, reported to the House Friday,

May 15, carries \$20,600,000 for vocational rehabilitation grants to the States, a reduction of \$2,400,000 below the budget and \$1,650,000 below the present appropriations.

It is extremely important to the handicapped of Missouri that the full amount requested in the budget be allowed to vocational rehabilitation. Any substantial cut in the amount requested will mean that services cannot be extended to 271 blind persons who were awaiting service on March 31, 1953, in the State of Missouri.

Vocational rehabilitation is self-liquidating, as handicapped people who are restored to useful employment return to the State and Federal Government, in taxes, many times the amount that is spent on their rehabilitation.

The present appropriation requested by the Division of Welfare for the coming biennium has increased the amount of State funds to match Federal funds for case services, from \$25,000 to \$50,000 per year. We will deeply appreciate your help in restoring the proposed cut in Federal funds.

Very sincerely yours,

PROCTOR N. CARTER,  
Director, Division of Welfare.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. THYE. In support of the committee's action I can only state that it was not taken because the committee did not have a heart. I know they had a heart, because the matter was discussed at some length. But it was felt that the States had not made the contribution to this very worthy program they should have made. The Federal Government has carried 67.67 percent of the expenses of the program. The committee endeavored to express this thought by recommending a reduction in the appropriation.

But I may say to the junior Senator from Michigan that I personally share the same feelings and thoughts he has expressed concerning vocational rehabilitation. Therefore, I will agree to accept the amendment, and that will end the matter.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Duff in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement of the legislative program. It will not take more than a minute or two. The only reason I interrupt at this time is that there is a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee, which is now in conference on the mutual aid bill, and I am due at the conference.

I have supplied this information to the secretary for the minority, to be transmitted to the Senator from Texas



[Mr. JOHNSON], and I preliminarily discussed it with the Senator from Texas prior to our policy committee meeting today.

After the pending appropriation bill is disposed of—and it is the intention of the acting majority leader to have the pending bill finished today, if that be possible, even if it be necessary to hold a night session—we intend to take up a number of bills which were passed over on the Consent Calendar and to which various Senators have requested that consideration be given. They will be taken up in the following order, if Senators care to make a note of the calendar numbers:

First, Calendar No. 496, Senate bill 2277, to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Italy and a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France.

Next, Calendar No. 494, Senate bill 2038, a bill to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government.

Next, Calendar No. 395, Senate Resolution 115, increasing the limit of expenditures for the Select Committee on Small Business.

Next, Calendar 153, Senate bill 16, to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees. I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to that bill.

Next, Calendar No. 389, Senate bill 1396, to authorize the adoption of certain rules with respect to the broadcasting or telecasting of professional baseball exhibitions in interstate commerce, and for other purposes, to which I invite the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Next, Calendar No. 478, Senate bill 2239, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

We would not want to be held precisely to taking the bills up in that order. I am assuming that Senators who are to handle the bills will be available, and we should like to take them up in that general order. There might be some variation of the order.

As soon as the emergency drought bill is ready, and the report has been printed, we shall be prepared to give it priority over any of the proposed legislation to which I have referred.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not know whether we shall have the report ready to print tonight. If not, it will be ready to be printed tomorrow, and by tomorrow night I think we shall be able to report a wheat allotment and quota bill which has to be acted upon this week if it is to meet the deadline of July 15.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Vermont that we will be prepared to give those bills the necessary priority if and when they are ready to be taken up by the Senate.

Mr. President, I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to the treaties which are on the Executive Calendar.

From tomorrow on the Senate should be prepared to take up treaties. Two groups of treaties are listed, the first having been reported under date of July 2, 1953, dealing with debt settlements and taxation. It is the second group the Senate should be prepared to consider and act upon first. Subsequent to that we shall take up the first group of treaties, which are the so-called status of forces agreements. They would be next in order.

I understand the Committee on Appropriations will have a meeting tomorrow to consider the second independent offices bill. I hope the bill will be reported by the committee tomorrow, and that the Senate will be prepared to take it up on Saturday.

I serve notice that the Senate should be prepared to hold Saturday sessions from now until the date of adjournment, which it is hoped will come approximately in the period around July 31 or August 1. In order to meet that date the Senate will be required to hold evening sessions, and Saturday sessions as well.

However, because a number of Senators have asked about it, and since it is proposed to take up next the group of bills to which I have referred, when action is completed on the present appropriation bill, I would not expect the Senate to continue in session to a late hour this evening unless action has not been completed on the appropriation bill, in which case we shall continue in session until the bill is passed.

Tomorrow being the day when it is proposed to consider the group of bills I have mentioned, which I hope will not entail prolonged discussions, it is not planned to hold an evening session Wednesday. But if Senators would arrange their plans accordingly, it may be necessary to hold evening sessions on Thursday and Friday, and depending on whether an appropriation bill is ready on Saturday, it may be necessary to meet all day Saturday, and perhaps into the evening. That is about as far in advance as I can now outline the program for the information of the Senate. However, with particular reference to the excess-profits tax and customs simplification measures, as soon as the House has acted and the Senate Committee on Finance has reported those measures to the Senate, the Senate should be prepared to find a place in the legislative program for consideration of those bills as well.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I submit an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "\$60,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$75,000,000."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this amendment would provide \$75 million for hospital construction, under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. The amendment was not approved by the committee, nor was it really rejected by the committee, because the vote in the committee was a tie, 8 to 8.

I now offer the amendment in the strong hope that the Senate will resolve the tie and agree to the amendment, providing \$75 million, as carried in the original estimate for hospital construction.

I had the honor, along with the former Senator from Ohio, Mr. Burton, of introducing the bill which became the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. Immediately after the introduction of the bill, Senator Burton, as we know, was appointed Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. It was at that time that our esteemed colleague, the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], lent his wise and able counsel to the development of the provisions of the bill, which became a law, and the drafting of regulations under the law.

The law and the result of the program have up to this time been an excellent example of bipartisan cooperation, with the major purpose of assisting the States to provide adequate hospital, clinical, and similar health services to all the people. It is an example of cooperation between the local communities, the States, and the Federal Government. Each of those partners has an important role to play in acquiring the hospitals and health facilities urgently needed by our country today. Under the law, the local community has the responsibility for leadership in the initiation of the projects, raising the matching funds, and determining the location and construction of the buildings. Finally, it has the responsibility for administration and control of the hospital when completed, without any form whatever of Federal control or interference.

The State has the responsibility of establishing the basic State plan. Sen-



ators may recall that under the law before any Federal funds can go to any State the State is required to make a survey of its hospital needs and its hospital resources; and, as a result of such survey, to develop a State plan for the construction of hospitals. That is to make sure that the money will be expended where it is most needed, and that the better part of wisdom will be followed in the location and building of the hospitals.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I wish to commend the Senator for offering the amendment, which I strongly support.

It seems to me that one thing we ought to bear in mind when we discuss the Hill amendment for the additional \$15 million is the fact that under the State plans there is a pretty general rule that State institutions for the care of the chronically ill—for example, those with mental illness, tuberculosis, or other chronic diseases—receive some priority under the limited funds for hospital construction. I want my colleagues to remember that if they are interested in a community hospital, a hospital in the town of ten or fifteen thousand, the general-purpose hospital. If they want such a hospital to receive Federal aid under the Hill-Burton Act, we shall have to appropriate the money for which the Senator from Alabama is asking.

I have just returned from my home State. I met with the hospital board in Willmar, Minn. I mention that to give an example in which the Senator may be interested. If the funds as now limited by the House action are all that are to be given by the Congress in the form of an appropriation, a large number of what we call regional or community general-purpose hospitals cannot be constructed because the State gives priority to mental institutions and other institutions which are needed for the chronically ill. So if we wish to take care of acute cases of illness in local communities, we shall have to support the Hill amendment or there will be no money. I think our colleagues ought to know that, because hundreds of communities are interested in the problem.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I was just about to point out that each State, and not the Federal Government, determines the priority of the projects, and also determines the percentage of Federal participation in the cost of each project.

This law was enacted to provide aid to the States. It is not a Federal program. It is a program of aid to the States, leaving to the States the right and the power to make most of the decisions. The Federal Government prescribes certain minimum standards, but I emphasize the word "minimum." Even in fixing those minimum standards, the United States Public Health Service must have the approval of those standards by the Federal Hospital Council, which, as the Senator knows, is composed of people from all over the United

States, representing various fields of endeavor and different schools of thought. We have thrown every safeguard around the program to insure that it will be a State program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The point I wish to make—and I think it is well taken, because of my own conversations and observations in the State of Minnesota—is this: As the Senator has said, each State has its own standards.

Mr. HILL. Subject to minimum standards which must be met.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. We had to establish minimum standards, to make sure that the program was properly carried out. However, the States determine the projects, and they determine the priorities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. My point is that there is a great deal of pressure on the States to take care of the chronically ill, which is, of course, understandable, and a very worthy purpose. But in respect to my own State of Minnesota I suggest that, unless the funds which the Senator from Alabama is seeking by this very moderate amendment are forthcoming, a number of communities which have already raised their matching funds, communities which have already purchased land sites, and have already done what I call the stage 1 work, will not be able to participate. Senators ought to know that, as it applies to their respective States.

Mr. HILL. Not only have many communities selected sites and perhaps purchased land, but many of them have issued bonds on which they must pay interest. Many of them have levied special taxes for the purpose of building hospitals. In other words, the States have assumed burdens for the construction of the hospitals; and unless funds are available, they will not be able to build them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the House figure remains without the amendment which the Senator from Alabama proposes, a large number of the general-purpose hospitals in the local communities cannot be constructed. I think that is the point we need to make perfectly clear.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct. I thank him for the contribution he has made, and for emphasizing this point. The building of many of what might be called community hospitals will not be possible unless this amendment is adopted so as to provide the necessary funds. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota is one of the coauthors of the pending amendment. I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. McCLELLAN rose.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I now yield to another coauthor of the pending amendment, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator, especially for yielding to me at this time, because I may have to leave the Chamber at any moment to attend an important committee meeting scheduled for 3 o'clock this afternoon.

I wish to call attention to the fact that there are 52 hospital projects in the United States which will be denied funds if this amount of money is not restored. Fifty-two projects will be denied the Federal share of contribution for this year, although the States established the projects in anticipation that the Federal Government would provide this money.

The fact that the Bureau of the Budget has not recommended sufficient funds does not relieve us of our responsibility to carry out in good faith at least the moral obligation of the Federal Government to make funds available.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator knows, the original estimate of the Bureau of the Budget was \$75 million. The act authorizes an appropriation of \$150 million. The Congress has never yet appropriated less than the \$75 million which my amendment now seeks to have appropriated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield further.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The States cannot proceed with these programs and make their plans without reliance upon the Federal Government. They make their plans in good faith, in anticipation that a reasonable appropriation will be made in order to enable them to proceed with construction.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was referring to a particular type of patients for whom many of these hospitals are intended to provide service. I invite attention to the fact that in my State we are building a large State institution. The State has acted in good faith in raising its money and in making appropriations. The hospital is now under construction. It would be a breach of faith with my State—and I am sure that is true of other States—for the three projects not to receive their share of the Federal contribution, which they have every right to expect, and upon which the State relied when it started its program.

I may say that there are only three such cases in my State, according to the list which will be found at page 805 of the hearings. One of those is the University of Arkansas Medical Center. It is a State hospital that is being provided.

Mr. HILL. I think that is the most important type. It is the very fountainhead, so to speak, for the training of doctors and the training of nurses. Its effect is felt in every city, hamlet, and community of the State.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Next is St. Vincent's Infirmary. It is a Catholic institution which is building a marvelous hospital in Little Rock. They have in good faith made their plans on that basis. Then there is another one at Hope, Ark. It is a small hospital.

As I have said, there are only three in my State, whereas in other States there



are many more. In Georgia there are 10. Indiana, I believe, has six. Kentucky, I believe, has 11. So on down the line. While there are only three in my State, I say, since the Committee on Appropriations was equally divided on the question of whether these funds should be placed in the bill, that very fact makes one of the strongest appeals to us as the representatives of the people, who themselves, as taxpayers and whose communities have met their share of the responsibility. Therefore, it behooves us to meet our responsibility and make sure that the program is carried on. Certainly in the case of the projects that are listed it would be a terrible burden to deprive them of these funds now.

Mr. HILL. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Arkansas. I want to emphasize everything he has said and to thank him for his very fine contribution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to say, too, that I must leave the floor for a committee meeting, but I hope to return before the debate has been concluded.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Arkansas, and I want to assure the Senator from Alabama that he certainly has my support for the amendment he has offered.

I should like to call attention to a very interesting fact with regard to our fiscal policy. We have no hesitancy at all in providing a \$3 billion subsidy for the private utilities of America in the form of a tax-amortization program, which is merely a nice technical way of saying what many people do not understand, namely, that we, the taxpayers, are building for the private utilities their plants and giving the plants to them, to the tune of \$3 billion. Yet we must make a fight on the floor of the Senate, to get this very small appropriation, comparatively speaking, for human welfare and for the protection of the sick, and to help those who are hospitalized, and to carry out what I think is the clear duty and function of our Government, namely, the placing of human values above the material values of private utilities, for example.

Of course, the fact that we have to make this kind of fight on the floor of the Senate to protect human values is only one of the many examples that can be cited to show how material values are placed above human values.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for the very strong argument which he has made in favor of the amendment, and his fine contribution to the debate.

Mr. MAYBANK rose.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yielded to my distinguished friend from Arkansas because he had to attend a committee meeting. Unless Senators are under great pressure, or feel they must leave the floor, I would appreciate it if they would wait until I have continued with my remarks. I had hardly started speaking when I was asked to yield. I would appreciate it if Senators would

permit me to proceed to the point where I begin to refer to the various States and what would happen if my amendment were not adopted.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say that harm would be done to all the States.

Mr. HILL. I appreciate that fact.

Mr. MAYBANK. To the whole United States.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall await the Senator's remarks.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. Not only would harm be done to the several States, but harm would also be done to the whole United States of America.

Mr. MAYBANK. And to all the people.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly right.

Mr. President, it is significant to note that the Hill-Burton program began as a 5-year program in 1946; was extended on October 25, 1949, by Public Law 380 in the 81st Congress to June 30, 1955; and currently, the Senate last month passed the bill introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART] and myself to extend the program to June 30, 1957. In the House, the extension for 2 years as provided in the bill introduced by Representative OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, has been acted on favorably by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of that body.

Every one of my colleagues in the Senate has had not one but many hospitals and health facilities constructed in his State under the program. All of us have constituents whose health has been restored, whose lives have been bettered and in many cases saved because of these "houses of mercy." Judged from every criteria of worth, we must continue to preserve at a high level this program of good health, good economics, good security, and good faith and trust in each other. It has been carefully administered by able officials at State and Federal levels, acclaimed by the majority of our citizens in the local communities, recognized and incorporated into the legislative records of all of our States and Territories, and copied and emulated by foreign nations.

In that connection, all of us know that one of the finest programs in which the Federal Government has ever participated and one that has contributed much to the welfare of the people of the United States is our public roads program.

I understand that the cost of administration of that program has been approximately 3 percent. The cost of the administration of the hospital program has been less than 1 percent. That shows how efficiently and how well and how economically the program has been administered at the Federal, State, and community levels.

In an effort to evaluate the program after 6 years of operation, the board of trustees of the American Hospital Association directed its council on government relations to conduct a series of four regional conferences during March, April, and May 1953. Two-day conferences were held in Washington, D. C., for the northeastern area; in New Orleans, La., for the southern area; in

Salt Lake City, Utah, for the western area; and in Chicago, Ill., for the central area of the United States. The conference participants were delegates from the hospital field in each of the 48 States and directors of the official State areas. These conferences were an honest search for the values and criticisms of the program. Facts and opinions of those persons who were closely associated with the operational aspect of the program and of those persons who were authorities in the hospital field but not connected with the program were freely presented, critically examined by the group, debated, and voted upon in the conference.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the expressions of the conferences:

First. There has been wide community acceptance of the principles of the Hospital Construction Act; it is one of the most popular domestic programs in which the Federal Government has ever participated, and local citizens' interest in providing good hospital services has been greatly stimulated and furthered, with a wide measure of community participation.

Second. For the first time in our history there has been statewide planning.

Third. Improved architectural design—more important in a hospital than in any other building.

I remind Senators that there is no other building in which architectural design is quite so important as it is in a hospital. Fumes from a kitchen or from a leaky valve cannot be permitted to enter a hospital operating room. Hospitals must have the best possible architectural design. Great improvement in their design has come about because of the work which has been done under this program.

Fourth. State licensure and improved hospital standards.

Fifth. Priority and assistance to many communities that otherwise would not have a hospital, and great efforts to meet the health needs of areas without facilities.

Sixth. Means of helping rural communities to attract and maintain physicians. Many communities that could not get a physician or have an adequate number of physicians because they had no hospital, now have the physicians they need.

Mr. President, we know that today, after a young physician has made the investment which is required of him in the way of education—after he has spent a number of years in obtaining an academic education, education in a medical school, and education through internship and hospital residency—he is unwilling to waste his ability in a community which is without the tools which he must have if he is to do his best work. He cannot have such tools unless a hospital is available. Therefore, nothing is more important than a hospital in enabling a community to have the services of competent physicians.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question on this point?



The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DUFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey, who is a coauthor of the pending amendment, and also is chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which has jurisdiction over hospital and health matters.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in a few minutes I shall address the Senate on this subject. Meantime I inquire whether the Senator from Alabama agrees that it is a fact that the increased number of hospitals provide additional facilities for young doctors to obtain the necessary training, through internship, and thus expand the facilities for the development of adequate medical care in the Nation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has made a good point, and I thank him for it.

Seventh. Good planning in the location of facilities has assisted in better distribution of doctors and other health personnel. That is the very point the Senator from New Jersey has just made. A great contribution has been made to the quality of patient care, improving the physical health and resultant economic well-being to both individuals and to communities, with the standards of health care in communities substantially raised.

Eighth. Early diagnosis of disease and better preventive medicine in health centers and hospitals.

Mr. President, as the Senator from New Jersey knows, in addition to the construction of hospitals, more than 400 centers for the early diagnosis of disease and for better preventive medicine have been constructed.

Ninth. Reactivation of inactive professional hospital personnel, especially nurses. Considerable numbers of professional personnel have come out of retirement, to work in the local hospitals. Nurses, for instance, who would not go to a city to work, have been willing to serve and work in the hospital in their own community. The new hospitals are training large numbers of new hospital personnel and are helping to relieve the shortages of health personnel.

Tenth. Costs have been in line with the costs of other hospitals not built under the program, and considerably lower than hospitals built entirely by the Federal Government—such as veterans' hospitals and hospitals for the Indians. I emphasize the point that the hospitals built under this program have been much lower in cost than have such federally built hospitals.

Eleventh. The existence of the program is insurance against socialization of health services, since the community itself is required to participate in the construction cost, and is further required to maintain the hospital after it has been built.

In other words, instead of a program of socialization by the Federal Government, under this program the responsibility, control, administration, and authority are vested in the local community, right at the grassroots. In that

way, and by providing for hospital care and for better medical care for the people, and by making such care much more available to all the people, we are effectively combating and so-called socialized medicine programs.

Mr. President, we have the problem of meeting the needs of our people for hospitalization and for medical care. Socialized medicine cannot be defeated simply by denouncing it. The way to defeat socialized medicine is by meeting the problem. That is exactly what we are doing by building these hospitals. In that way we are cutting the ground from under any movement for socialized medicine.

Twelfth. The construction of the hospitals has greatly stimulated enrollment in voluntary prepayment plans, such as Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and hospitalization insurance. Many hospitals have given great encouragement and help to enrollment in the voluntary plans, and have contributed much to lessening the demand for socialized medicine.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to have the Senator from Alabama bring this matter to the forefront, because he was very active in the furtherance of the voluntary hospitalization insurance program, such as the Blue Cross, and the voluntary prepaid medical-care program, the Blue Shield. They are only two of many private programs of that sort; but in the main, all of them are dependent upon the availability of a hospital and adequate clinical facilities. It will be impossible to promote voluntary health insurance and prepaid medical care on a voluntary basis unless the necessary hospitals are available.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is entirely correct. What good would health insurance be if the necessary medical facilities were not available? There must be both.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that in many of the smaller communities or in the areas which sometimes are referred to as rural, the greatest shortage of doctors and the greatest shortage of health facilities exist? Therefore, in connection with the attempt to meet the health and medical needs of the people of those areas, the establishment of a proper hospital may mean the difference between proper medical care and no medical care, particularly in view of the shortage of doctors.

Mr. HILL. That is entirely correct. Many of our hospitals have been integrated with voluntary prepayment programs—for instance, the so-called Blue Cross or Blue Shield. It has been in the interest of the patient and in the interest of the hospital to stimulate such programs and, insofar as possible, to tie them in with the hospitals. One of the best achievements of the program has been its stimulation and encouragement of voluntary health insurance.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who is one of the coauthors of the pending amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. As I interpret the schedules appearing on pages 805 to 807 of the hearings conducted by the subcommittee, I find that the increase of \$15 million in the appropriation would not add any additional funds for the State of Mississippi under this allotment. However, I wish to point out, especially in reference to the matter the Senator from Alabama was mentioning, namely, the inability of rural counties to obtain a sufficient number of doctors unless some sort of program is made available, that in my home country only one new doctor located there since prior to 1920, until we had a hospital under this program. Since that time we have had an abundance of doctors, and we have a list of applicants. That has occurred because the facilities are available. The doctors there can practice their profession with every advantage which they could have in a large city.

At the time when the hospital was constructed, I thought it would be a liability and would place a great carrying charge on the county. We anticipated that there would have to be a heavy levy in order to subsidize the hospital. However, under the insurance plan, to which reference has been made, although the hospital is not yet fully self-sustaining, it is well on the way to being so. That is a fine illustration of the importance of the program. Without it the hospital would not be there.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Without the insurance program it could not have been self-sustaining. At this time everyone is cared for by facilities and hospitals staffed by well-trained doctors. Everyone is paying his way, and we are well on the way to a greatly improved condition, whereas, before that, to my personal knowledge, there was actually a lack of proper medical facilities, with no chance to get young doctors for the purpose of replacing those who were passing out of the picture.

I commend the Senator from Alabama for offering the amendment and supporting it so ably.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I may say I know of no Senator who has been more interested in this program or who has worked harder for it than has the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I know that he bears testimony to the efficacy and the success of the program as the result of his personal investigations. I know that he has traversed his own State, visiting the hospitals, to observe how the program is working. I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. MAYBANK rose.

Mr. HILL. I wonder whether I might be permitted to go a little bit further, since I am nearing the end of my remarks. I do not want to cut off my friend from South Carolina. He knows that he is my beloved friend.

Mr. President, I shall enumerate some of the assets of this program, as brought out in conferences which were held throughout the United States under the auspices of the Hospital Association.

Thirteenth. The next asset I desire to emphasize is one that has been mentioned before. It is the complete freedom of action by State and local hos-



pital construction agencies, with States' rights preserved and absolutely no Federal control. Excellent Federal, State, and local community cooperation in solving needs in the area of hospital and health care.

I come now to the last asset to which I shall refer.

Fourteenth. An asset to civil defense in providing many hospitals outside of our big cities and our great, concentrated industrial centers.

With such manifold benefits to the States and to the people of the country, it is not surprising that since 1946 Congress has appropriated \$542,500,000 for the Hill-Burton program, as follows:

Fiscal year 1948.....	\$75,000,000
Fiscal year 1949.....	75,000,000
Fiscal year 1950.....	150,000,000
Fiscal year 1951.....	85,000,000
Fiscal year 1952.....	82,500,000
Fiscal year 1953.....	75,000,000

These Federal funds have been matched by over \$1,100,000,000 in local or local and State funds. The program to date is one of \$1,600,000,000. The funds have been matched by more than 2 to 1. The heavy burden has been borne, not by the Federal Government, but by the States and the local communities.

As of June 1, 1953, 2,078 hospitals, public health centers and related facilities had been approved—1,212 of these were completed, open and rendering a community service. Seven hundred and seven were under construction. The remaining projects were in the planning or drawing board stages.

These projects are adding 101,000 hospital beds and over 400 public health centers to our Nation's resources. Nearly three-fourths of the total projects are for general hospitals; 16 percent for public health centers; and the remaining 10 percent for mental, tuberculosis and chronic-disease hospitals. Over 1,200 or 59 percent of the projects are completely new facilities; 41 percent are additions, alterations and expansion of existing facilities.

Of the 900 completely new general hospitals being built under the program, 450 are located in communities that had no hospital facility, and 150 are located in communities where the only hospital was substandard and not acceptable.

Of the 1,200 new facilities, 56 percent are located in communities of less than 5,000 population. 57 percent of the new hospitals have fewer than 50 beds and only 21 percent have 100 beds or more. They are getting into communities that desperately need hospitals, but that have been unable to get them in the past. On the other hand, nearly 170 larger projects, such as teaching hospitals approved for intern and residency training are utilizing \$91 million of the total Federal funds made available to date. Similarly, 21 teaching facilities at university medical centers in 18 States, which are the capstones of our entire State medical system, have been allocated over \$23 million. The program, therefore, is not overlooking the needs of the larger institutions in their vital role of training physicians, nurses and

other medical personnel and particularly for utilization in staffing the small hospitals and health centers.

The original surveys made by the States indicated that in the Nation there was a deficiency of more than 900,000 beds. Senators will recall that I mentioned the fact that these surveys had to be made before a single dollar could be spent within a State. While the program has added 101,000 beds to our hospital reservoir and while a substantial amount of hospital construction has taken place outside of the program, the need for beds has increased commensurate with population increases. The current State plan revisions indicate that our total needs today in hospital beds approach the 2-million mark, of which we have approximately 1,057,000 acceptable beds, and a deficiency of 850,000. Even when one takes into consideration the existence of 117,000 Federal hospital beds such as those administered by the Veterans' Administration and the Indian Service, our national hospital bed deficiency still stands at 733,000. Although substantial progress in constructing hospital beds has been made during the past 6 years, the Nation is still confronted with a tremendous hospital bed deficiency. While the progress made with respect to general hospital bed construction is gratifying, progress in meeting the specialized needs of chronic disease and mental disease beds in particular, has been slow. Increasing emphasis must be given to satisfying our needs for such specialized hospital services. Furthermore, the factors of increasing bed need due to population increase and obsolescence cannot be overlooked.

The population increase of more than 2 million annually has been estimated to require in excess of 24,000 beds. Approximately 6,000 hospital beds become obsolete and need replacement annually. Senators will recall that during the depression, during World War II, and during the defense period, very few hospitals were constructed. The result is that today our national hospital-bed deficiency still stands at 733,000, with 6,000 beds becoming substandard or unacceptable each year, and with 24,000 additional beds needed merely as a result of the increase in our population.

Occupancy rates are frequently quoted as direct evidence of the need of a community for a hospital. One must realize that many factors influence occupancy rates. A hospital built in a community which had a 100 percent occupancy rate immediately would indicate that the community should have built a larger hospital. It is a well known fact that the small hospital cannot expect high occupancy rates at all times because it cannot hope to provide all of the special services required in all types of cases. The Hill-Burton Act took cognizance of this fact when it included the principle of the base, regional and district hospital—ranging in size downward—in the Hill-Burton program. We must have available beds in all our hospitals if we are to adequately cope with the too-frequent, highway accidents, emergency cases, disasters due to wind, flood, fire and disease, and epidemics,

What would Massachusetts and other tornado stricken areas have done but for available hospital beds? I can assure you that today the hospitals in the city of Montgomery in the State of Alabama struggling with an outbreak of poliomyelitis are utilizing their beds.

Our hospitals like most of our public service institutions must be on a standby basis for any eventuality. I like a statement which is attributed to Assistant Surgeon General Frederick C. Smith, retired, of the United States Public Health Service. He wrote these words over 25 years ago when he had charge of the Division of Hospitals of that Service:

A hospital pays higher dividends in usefulness than any other public building. A department, bureau, agency, or court, post office or custom house is open only a third of each 24 hours and is closed 52 Sundays and many holidays each year. A hospital is never closed. Its lights are an eternal fire on the altar of service. Its door is never locked; its windows never darkened.

When vacation grass grows lush on silent schoolhouse grounds, the hospital knows no respite. While the cathedral drowns many days each week over empty pews, the hospital vibrates through every crowded moment with never-failing service to humanity. Through long, hot summer days and nights, as in winter storm and autumn blast, the hospital carries on. In public disaster, when other enterprise is dazed and crippled, the hospital never fails.

The best that is in men and women is brought out in the crises that try the soul. In operating room and ward is forged, in the fire of sacrifice and renunciation, the character that ennobles. Pious resignation, courage and generosity are here daily witnessed. To the hospital come both saint and sinner, the victim of wasting disease, of violence or of his own vicious habits. Whether they march to the drums of war or the pipes of peace, the sick and maimed seek refuge where pain is eased and life held sacred and find there, true to hospital traditions, not only scientific efficiency, but tolerance, kindness, and understanding sympathy.

In the planning for hospitals there are 34 of the 53 States and Territories phasing the construction allocation of Federal funds over several years. A project phased out in this manner is known as a "split" project. It is the only way in which a State, in many instances, due to existence of great need for hospitals, can acquire them with a small State allocation of Federal funds. In other States large teaching hospitals with many expensive technical equipment items require quite large sums to build and as a result are phased out over several years. There are certain types of hospitals we should not try to build. It takes much time to build them. They should be built very carefully.

Lack of a firm basis of known Federal assistance makes planning for hospitals and the allocation of Federal funds very difficult for the State agencies.

The representative of the American Hospital Association, Mr. A. V. Whitehall, testifying before the Senate Appropriations Committee a few days ago, declared:

We are disturbed, Mr. Chairman, about the suggestion that the current appropriation or the Hill-Burton bill should be curtailed.



There are two major arguments against such curtailment.

First, it takes more than a year to plan a hospital project, raise funds in the community, and complete construction. As a matter of fact, community leaders may have 2 or 3 years of aggressive planning and fund-raising before they can apply for Hill-Burton funds.

One strength of the Hill-Burton program has been its stability and continuity. The fact that community leaders can plan ahead and depend on the Federal Government for help has made long-range planning possible on projects that are most needed. In several States communities have raised funds and begun construction of hospitals anticipating that Federal funds would be available in an orderly manner.

Uncertainty and fluctuation in annual appropriations do severe harm to this orderly planning and discourage communities from building needed hospitals.

A second argument against curtailment of Federal funds is that, of all Federal programs involving use of Federal funds for hospital construction, the Hill-Burton program has unique features that we should encourage. It requires planning of the hospitals' location. It requires community participation in the cost of construction. A maximum amount of hospital construction is accomplished at a minimum cost to the Federal Government.

Why upset the program now, Mr. President, and leave it in confusion, doubt, and uncertainty, after it has succeeded so well?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend from Rhode Island, who is one of the authors of the pending amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I desire to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Alabama for the fine appeal he has made. The question which is disturbing me is, What reasons have been given for the reduction of \$15 million? Is it a meat-ax cut, or is there some reason given for the reduction? Certainly, the need for hospitals is pressing, and the distinguished Senator makes a fine appeal for them.

Mr. HILL. I have found no sound or solid reason for cutting the program. I know of no reason why the program should be cut down. If any reason has been given in the hearings, I have not found it anywhere.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I was very much pleased a few days ago to read an editorial which, in my opinion, paid true and proper tribute to the great service rendered not only to the State of Alabama, but to all America by the distinguished, able, generous, and good senior Senator from Alabama. Having followed the distinguished Senator in the past in his brilliant leadership in support of this program, I am very pleased now to follow his leadership in this legislative body.

He has made one of the most eloquent appeals it has ever been my privilege to hear. This is an extremely worthwhile program, one which has brought untold benefits already and which will continue to bring even greater benefits in the future.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend from Tennessee for

his more than generous and gracious words, and I express to him my deep appreciation for them and also for his fine words of support of the program and of the pending amendment.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I recognize the fact that the Senator from Alabama does not want to be questioned on certain phases of the subject—

Mr. HILL. I am just about to reach the part of my statement to which, I think, the Senator from Kentucky has reference.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I understood the Senator to suggest that there is a shortage of more than 700,000 beds.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLEMENTS. To continue this program at the rate of \$50 million or \$60 million a year, or to continue it at the figure which the Senator from Alabama is suggesting in his amendment, how many decades will it take to meet the requirements of the people of America for the necessary number of hospitals in the areas where they are most needed.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Kentucky should take into account the fact that some hospitals become obsolete and unusable each year, and should also take into account the fact that additional hospitals will be required to meet the increase in population. I cannot tell how many decades it will take, but I am sure it will take a great many.

Mr. CLEMENTS. More decades than the Senator from Alabama would suggest that any Member of this body might be on this earth.

Mr. HILL. I do not think any Member of this body will ever see the program completed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] when he paid his respects to the Senator from Alabama and expressed his appreciation for the very valuable work that had been done under the program which has been sponsored by the Senator from Alabama. To my mind, Mr. President, there is no grant-in-aid program that has done so much with so little dissension at the local level, the State level, and the national level as has this program. Later on I should like to discuss some matters pertaining to my State.

Mr. HILL. I wish to thank the Senator for his kind words and also for his excellent contribution.

On the basis of \$60 million for the Hill-Burton program, as provided in the committee amendment, 10 States will be denied sufficient funds to cover the approved split projects in the coming fiscal year, 1954. Sixty-four communities will be adversely affected. These communities are all advanced in their planning or in their contracts and construction beyond the wishful thinking stages. They have spent local funds for architects' plans, some have issued bonds, some have levied taxes, and 45 of them have their projects under contract or actually under construction. They must have Federal funds to carry through to completion the hospital and health facility projects

which have received approval under the program.

It seems clear, as the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] brought out earlier, that Congress has the moral responsibility, at least, to make certain that the States and communities are not hurt because of their reliance on the fact that Congress would not make an appropriation that amounted to less than half the \$150 million authorized by the act.

As I have said before, Congress has never yet appropriated less than the \$75 million provided in the pending amendment. In a number of years Congress has appropriated more than \$75 million. The States to which I have adverted are Arkansas, Georgia, Indiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, and Kentucky.

In addition to those 10 States, 7 States, if the amendment is defeated, will receive less than \$100,000 each for any new projects. In other words, the programs in those 7 States will almost come to an end. Those States are Arizona, Florida, Montana, New Mexico, New York, Vermont, and Virginia.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York. I have just spoken of the fact that his State, unless the amendment shall be agreed to, will get less than \$100,000 for new projects.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the Senator from Alabama that away back, long before I ever thought of coming to the Senate, he was one of the men of whom I had heard, whom I admired, and who was universally respected for his great service to the health and educational needs of the entire Nation. I am very happy, indeed, to associate myself with the remarks that have been made previously this afternoon.

I wish to ask the Senator from Alabama: Did not the original authorization call for an annual appropriation of \$150 million?

Mr. HILL. That is true.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe that for many years appropriations either reached that figure or came within a fair distance of it. Is it not a fact that the amount proposed to be appropriated by the committee amendment, if it is adopted, will be the smallest amount ever to be appropriated. I hope the Senator's amendment will prevail, but if Congress should appropriate as little as \$60 million, would not that constitute substantially the smallest amount of money for hospital construction under existing legislation in the history of Congress?

Mr. HILL. It would constitute the smallest amount of money appropriated since the act was passed in 1946. Furthermore, I may say to the Senator that \$60 million today is not what it was in 1946, when the act was passed. Instead of being \$60 million in contemplation of the act, the amount would be perhaps \$50 million, which would mean that Congress would be appropriating not more than one-third of what the act authorized.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?



Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the need for hospital construction in many States of the Union such, for instance, as Alabama, New York, Arkansas, Tennessee, Kentucky, is certainly as great today as it has ever been in the history of the country, if not greater?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New York is absolutely correct. I have sought to emphasize that by referring to the increase in population, to the large number of beds which become unusable each year by reason of obsolescence, and to the fact that for a long time, during the depression during the defense program before World War II, during World War II, and even during the Korean war, it has been necessary to curtail the construction of hospitals.

Mr. LEHMAN. Like the Senator from Alabama, I have been in public life for a great many years. With respect to virtually every activity I have observed during the 30 years I have been in public life, I have heard some criticism. It may not have been justified criticism, but at least I have heard some criticism of one activity or another, of this point of view or that point of view. However, I am happy to be able to say that in all the years my memory takes me back, I have never heard any criticism raised against the Hospital Construction Act or any question raised with regard to its value. Is the Senator from Alabama not in agreement with that point of view?

Mr. HILL. I have heard no valid criticism and I think there has been no valid criticism of the act.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am willing to go a step further and say that I have never heard any criticism from thinking people.

Mr. HILL. I thank the able Senator from New York.

Mr. President, there is an important conference committee meeting which the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] wishes to attend. He is one of the authors of the amendment. I am very anxious to have him say something about the amendment before he leaves for the conference committee meeting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two tables which tell the story as to the 10 States to which I have referred, and the critical situation which will confront them if Congress does not appropriate the full \$75 million.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I

State	Amount in split projects for 1954	Allotment based on \$60,000,000	Difference
Arkansas.....	\$1,646,136	\$1,322,676	\$323,460
Georgia.....	2,417,275	2,172,443	244,832
Indiana.....	1,421,280	1,397,206	24,074
Kentucky.....	2,016,514	1,855,945	160,569
Mississippi.....	1,907,067	1,721,175	185,892
New Jersey.....	1,538,606	1,185,653	352,953
Ohio.....	2,634,535	2,306,027	328,508
Rhode Island.....	319,776	247,602	72,174
South Carolina.....	1,800,000	1,458,276	341,724
Utah.....	381,000	317,151	63,849
Total.....	16,082,189	13,984,154	2,098,035

TABLE II

State	Amount in split projects for 1954 under construction only	Allotment based on \$60,000,000	Difference
Arkansas.....	\$1,646,136	\$1,322,676	\$323,460
Georgia.....	25,417	2,172,443	0
Indiana.....	1,421,280	1,397,206	24,074
Kentucky.....	2,016,514	1,855,945	160,569
Mississippi.....	763,067	1,721,175	0
New Jersey.....	1,538,606	1,185,653	352,953
Ohio.....	2,042,535	2,306,027	0
Rhode Island.....	319,776	247,602	72,174
South Carolina.....	1,800,000	1,458,276	341,724
Utah.....	None	317,151	0
Total.....	11,573,331	13,984,154	1,274,954

NOTE.—Arizona, Florida, Montana, New Mexico, New York, Vermont, and Virginia, less than \$100,000 for new projects.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, according to recent reports from the States there exist applications sufficient to cover \$153 million in Federal funds in fiscal year 1954.

The difference of \$15 million between the \$75 million and the \$60 million would mean the loss of the construction of at least 3,000 new and additional hospital beds to help meet the shocking deficiency in beds today.

I have taken the time of the Senate at some length in an effort to clearly present the facts. I am of the firm conviction that the Hospital Survey and Construction Act has truly and well served the interests of all the people and of the Nation. It is essential that the serious deficit in our Nation's hospital facilities be reduced as a part of our economic and our security program. I am certain that the Federal funds appropriated for assistance to the communities of our Nation to acquire badly needed hospitals is a wise and sound investment in times of peace as well as emergency. We must recognize that the fate and the fortunes of our country lie in its strength. In building hospitals we are building the health of our people, we are building the strength of our people, we are building the strength of America. We are making America strong that we may keep America free.

In the words of Edmund Burke, "Economy is a distributive virtue, and consists not in saving but in selection. Parsimony requires no providence, no sagacity, no powers of combination, no comparison, no judgment."

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HILL. I wish to yield first to the Senator from New Jersey, who must shortly attend a conference committee meeting. I shall be delighted to yield later to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no desire to delay the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to support, with all the force at my command, the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. During 8 years of experience on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which has been during my entire service in the Senate, there has been no subject, outside of immediate labor problems, that has

concerned me more than the health of our people. I had the privilege of being a member of the committee when the Hill-Burton Act was passed. I remember the hearings on that act.

In my judgment no act in which the Senator from Alabama has participated during his valuable service in the Senate is of greater importance than this act. We have tried various approaches to the question of safeguarding the health of our people. In this act, in my judgment, we have done more, with comparatively small appropriations, to bring about the extension of an intensive and effective health service than under any other program.

I have had prepared, for the purpose of my few remarks, a statement which I shall not read, but I shall presently ask to have printed in the RECORD. It contains many of the facts which the Senator from Alabama has covered in his address.

This program has been in operation for 5 years. This is the 6th year. Because of that fact a number of States, including my own, have undertaken hospital projects relying in perfectly good faith on the probability—they never could say the certainty—that the Congress would continue a program of this importance which would justify the States in undertaking projects which might require more than 1 year to carry through.

To indicate what I mean by what I have just said, and to indicate why I feel that the States were justified in relying upon what has been done in the past, I shall call attention, year by year, to the actual appropriations under the Hospital Construction Act since 1948.

In 1948 the appropriation was \$75 million. In 1949 it was \$75 million. In 1950 it was \$150 million. In 1951 it was \$85 million. In 1952 it was \$82,500,000, or a total of almost \$550 million. The important thing is that that was the Federal contribution. The figures show that in various communities where the Federal money was applied and used the actual contribution by the people of such communities was \$1 billion. So we have been able, through this legislation, to provide \$1½ billion worth of hospital construction, because a contribution of \$2 for \$1 was made locally.

I mention that because I wish to point out that the suggested \$60 million appropriation for this year, which amount is proposed by the Senate committee, and also, more unfortunately, the \$50 million approved by the House, would leave half way between sea and sky a great many projects which were undertaken in good faith, and for which Federal money was scheduled. Local organizations, such as the bureau of institutions and agencies in my State of New Jersey, gave certain assurances to those who were raising money and to those who were given the contracts for the construction of the hospitals.

All those facts have placed us in such a position that, if this money is not appropriated this year, there will be a total, in dollars, of more than \$16 million so-called split projects throughout the country, and there will be a deficit, in the event the \$60 million figure is appropriated, of approximately \$2 mil-



lion. Taking my own State of New Jersey, the deficit would amount to \$352,000 plus, for which we are committed, for which we have entered into contracts—obligations which we are unable to meet because we have drained every source we could to match Federal funds, relying on the expectation of a \$75 million appropriation for this year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared covering some of these points.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY  
IN SUPPORT OF SENATOR HILL'S AMENDMENT  
FOR HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

The Hospital Survey and Construction Act (Hill-Burton program), as enacted in August 1946, authorized an appropriation of \$75 million each fiscal year to assist in the construction of needed hospitals and other health facilities in the States with Federal participation limited to 33½ percent. In October 1949 the act was amended by Public Law 380, 81st Congress, increasing the annual authorization for construction purposes to \$150 million and abolishing the arbitrary one-third participation in each State by substituting a provision permitting the States to establish the rate of Federal participation varying from 33½ percent to 66½ percent.

Beginning with the fiscal year 1948 the Congress has made available Federal funds for construction purposes for each fiscal year as follows:

1948-----	\$75,000,000
1949-----	75,000,000
1950-----	150,000,000
1951-----	85,000,000
1952-----	82,500,000

Total----- 542,500,000

As of June 1, 1953, only some \$15 million of the total \$542,500,000 has not been allocated to specific projects.

During the 6 years for which the Congress has made funds available for construction purposes 2,078 projects adding approximately 101,000 hospital beds and over 400 health centers have been approved. The total cost of these projects represents approximately \$1,600,000,000 of which the Federal Government is contributing slightly over \$500 million and the project sponsors more than \$1 billion. During the same period of time only approximately \$650,000 or slightly more than one-tenth of 1 percent, of the more than \$500 million appropriated has been returned to the Federal Treasury.

On the basis of a \$60 million appropriation 10 States will receive allotments which are insufficient to meet the tentative commitments to split projects in the 1954 fiscal year. There are seven additional States which, after meeting the tentative commitments on split projects, would have less than \$100,000 available for the approval of new projects. For all practical purposes seven States would be unable to approve new projects. On the basis of a \$50 million appropriation, 18 States would be unable to meet tentative commitments to split projects for the 1954 fiscal year or after meeting these commitments will have a balance of less than \$100,000 available for the approval of new projects.

The value of the Hill-Burton program should not be considered solely in terms of the hospital beds and health centers added to the available supply of such facilities in the country. For example, during the 6 years that the program has been in operation

the total dollar volume of health facility construction outside of the program has been roughly twice as much as under the program. There is no question but that the program has stimulated the construction of needed health facilities by pointing up the great need for additional construction, as reflected in the construction programs developed by the State agency, and by providing funds to assist the construction in the most needy areas. According to the programs developed by the State agencies there still is a need for the construction of more than 700,000 hospital beds and over 1,500 health centers in order to achieve the goal which is to provide adequate hospital, clinic, and similar services to the people of the country.

The majority of the facilities constructed with Federal aid are in rural or semiurban areas of the country and not the large metropolitan cities and industrial centers. This may be providential in that many of these facilities could well become the evacuation centers for the large metropolitan and industrial areas under a war emergency.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table designated as "Table 1," and headed "States receiving insufficient funds under an appropriation of \$60 million to cover split projects in fiscal year 1954." The table shows in parallel columns those projects now under construction and projects not already under construction, but which have been provided for. The States are Arkansas, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Mississippi, New Jersey, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Utah.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—States receiving insufficient funds under an appropriation of 60 million to cover split projects in fiscal year 1954

State and project	Under construction Federal share	Not under construction Federal share
<b>Arkansas:</b>		
Little Rock, University of Arkansas Medical Center	\$599,000	-----
Little Rock, St. Vincent Infirmary	997,136	-----
Fort Smith, St. Edwards Mercy	50,000	-----
	1,646,136	-----
<b>Georgia:</b>		
Brunswick, Glynn County Health Center	25,417	-----
Covington, Newton County	-----	\$114,816
Ellijay, Watkins Memorial	-----	52,967
Marietta, Kennestone	-----	157,500
Statesboro, Bulloch County	-----	126,000
Bremen, Bremen	-----	53,000
Columbus, Muscogee County Health Center	-----	70,892
Macon, Macon City	-----	846,170
Savannah, Memorial Hospital	-----	753,830
Oglethorpe, Macon County Health Center	-----	11,581
Waycross, Ware County	-----	200,000
Milledgeville, Baldwin County Health Center	-----	5,102
	25,417	2,391,858
<b>Indiana:</b>		
Terre Haute, the Union Hospital	166,875	-----
Fort Wayne, Methodist Hospital	479,169	-----
Elkhart, Elkhart General	194,162	-----
Goshen, Goshen Hospital	63,484	-----
Terre Haute, St. Anthony's	16,095	-----
Evansville, St. Mary's	501,495	-----
	1,421,280	-----
<b>Kentucky:</b>		
Lexington, Good Samaritan	\$150,000	-----
Ashland, Kings Daughters	33,333	-----
Danville, Ephraim McDowell	83,581	-----
Georgetown, John Graves Ford	101,250	-----
Bellefonte, Bellefonte	254,546	-----
Fort Thomas, Campbell County General	407,825	-----
Elizabethtown, Hardin County	176,548	-----
Paducah, Riverside Hospital	153,097	-----
Shelbyville, Shelby County	178,312	-----
Louisville, Jewish Hospital	428,022	-----
Bowling Green, Bowling Green-Warren	50,000	-----
	2,016,514	-----
<b>Mississippi:</b>		
Jackson, University Teaching Hospital	390,000	-----
Newton, Newton County	45,000	-----
Gulfport, Memorial Hospital	328,067	-----
Vicksburg, Mercy Hospital, Street Memorial	-----	\$349,000
Vicksburg, Lutheran Hospital	-----	349,000
Yazoo City, Kings Daughters	-----	400,000
Killmichael, Killmichael Clinic	-----	46,000
	763,067	1,144,000
<b>New Jersey:</b>		
Mount Holly, Burlington County	23,696	-----
Cedar Grove, Overbrook	70,000	-----
Plainfield, Muhlenburg	193,850	-----
Paterson, St. Josephs	38,731	-----
Hackensack, Hackensack Hospital	250,680	-----
Trenton, St. Francis Hospital	511,150	-----
Summit, Overlook	285,499	-----
Ancora, Fourth State Hospital	165,000	-----
	1,538,606	-----
<b>Ohio:</b>		
Barberton, Barberton Citizens	160,088	-----
Akron, Peoples	479,339	-----
Warren, Trumbull Memorial	250,000	-----
Bay Village, Bay View	20,357	-----
East Liverpool, East Liverpool City	199,278	-----
Cleveland, Fairview Park	250,000	-----
Marion, Marion	400,000	-----
Youngstown, Youngstown	232,677	-----
Cuyahoga Falls, Green Cross General	50,796	-----
Youngstown, St. Elizabeth	-----	492,000
Warren, St. Josephs Riverside	-----	100,000
	2,042,535	592,000
<b>Rhode Island:</b>		
Pawtucket, the Memorial	5,000	-----
Cranston, Osteopathic General	55,000	-----
Providence, Miriam	126,601	-----
Providence, Roger Williams General	133,175	-----
	319,776	-----
<b>South Carolina:</b> Charleston, Medical College of State of South Carolina	1,800,000	-----
<b>Utah:</b> Provo, Utah State Hospital	-----	381,000
<b>Total</b>	11,573,331	4,508,853

TABLE I.—States receiving insufficient funds under an appropriation of 60 million to cover split projects in fiscal year 1954—Continued

State and project	Under construction Federal share	Not under construction Federal share
<b>Kentucky:</b>		
Lexington, Good Samaritan	\$150,000	-----
Ashland, Kings Daughters	33,333	-----
Danville, Ephraim McDowell	83,581	-----
Georgetown, John Graves Ford	101,250	-----
Bellefonte, Bellefonte	254,546	-----
Fort Thomas, Campbell County General	407,825	-----
Elizabethtown, Hardin County	176,548	-----
Paducah, Riverside Hospital	153,097	-----
Shelbyville, Shelby County	178,312	-----
Louisville, Jewish Hospital	428,022	-----
Bowling Green, Bowling Green-Warren	50,000	-----
	2,016,514	-----
<b>Mississippi:</b>		
Jackson, University Teaching Hospital	390,000	-----
Newton, Newton County	45,000	-----
Gulfport, Memorial Hospital	328,067	-----
Vicksburg, Mercy Hospital, Street Memorial	-----	\$349,000
Vicksburg, Lutheran Hospital	-----	349,000
Yazoo City, Kings Daughters	-----	400,000
Killmichael, Killmichael Clinic	-----	46,000
	763,067	1,144,000
<b>New Jersey:</b>		
Mount Holly, Burlington County	23,696	-----
Cedar Grove, Overbrook	70,000	-----
Plainfield, Muhlenburg	193,850	-----
Paterson, St. Josephs	38,731	-----
Hackensack, Hackensack Hospital	250,680	-----
Trenton, St. Francis Hospital	511,150	-----
Summit, Overlook	285,499	-----
Ancora, Fourth State Hospital	165,000	-----
	1,538,606	-----
<b>Ohio:</b>		
Barberton, Barberton Citizens	160,088	-----
Akron, Peoples	479,339	-----
Warren, Trumbull Memorial	250,000	-----
Bay Village, Bay View	20,357	-----
East Liverpool, East Liverpool City	199,278	-----
Cleveland, Fairview Park	250,000	-----
Marion, Marion	400,000	-----
Youngstown, Youngstown	232,677	-----
Cuyahoga Falls, Green Cross General	50,796	-----
Youngstown, St. Elizabeth	-----	492,000
Warren, St. Josephs Riverside	-----	100,000
	2,042,535	592,000
<b>Rhode Island:</b>		
Pawtucket, the Memorial	5,000	-----
Cranston, Osteopathic General	55,000	-----
Providence, Miriam	126,601	-----
Providence, Roger Williams General	133,175	-----
	319,776	-----
<b>South Carolina:</b> Charleston, Medical College of State of South Carolina	1,800,000	-----
<b>Utah:</b> Provo, Utah State Hospital	-----	381,000
<b>Total</b>	11,573,331	4,508,853

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks table II, showing the amount in split projects for



1954, the allotment based on an appropriation of \$60 million in each case, and the deficit.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II

State	Amount in split projects for 1954	Allotment based on \$60,000,000	Deficit
Arkansas.....	\$1,646,136	\$1,322,676	\$323,460
Georgia.....	2,417,275	2,172,443	244,832
Indiana.....	1,421,280	1,397,206	24,074
Kentucky.....	2,016,514	1,855,945	160,569
Mississippi.....	1,907,067	1,721,175	185,892
New Jersey.....	1,538,606	1,185,653	352,953
Ohio.....	2,634,535	2,306,027	328,508
Rhode Island.....	319,776	247,602	72,174
South Carolina.....	1,800,000	1,458,276	341,724
Utah.....	381,000	317,151	63,849
Total.....	16,082,189	13,984,154	2,098,035

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a third table, showing the amount in split projects for 1954, representing projects actually under construction; the allotment based on a \$60-million appropriation; and the deficit.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE III

State	Amount in split projects for 1954 under construction only	Allotment based on \$60,000,000	Deficit
Arkansas.....	\$1,646,136	\$1,322,676	\$323,460
Georgia.....	25,417	2,172,443	0
Indiana.....	1,421,280	1,397,206	24,074
Kentucky.....	2,016,514	1,855,945	160,569
Mississippi.....	763,067	1,721,175	0
New Jersey.....	1,538,606	1,185,653	352,953
Ohio.....	2,042,535	2,306,027	0
Rhode Island.....	319,776	247,602	72,174
South Carolina.....	1,800,000	1,458,276	341,724
Utah.....	None	317,151	0
Total.....	11,573,331	13,984,154	1,274,954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Without going into all the details, the total deficit in the projects today under construction throughout the United States amounts to \$1,274,954, on the basis of an appropriation of \$60 million.

Let me say further that I realize the difficulties under which we are operating. The Governor of my State and the head of the Bureau of Institutions and Agencies have called upon me, as have representatives of the hospital projects. I refer to my State only as an example. I am speaking just as much in behalf of other States.

With respect to my own State, I have been asked what could be done. I took the subject up with Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. She has been most eager to cooperate, but she indicates that she will be bound, of course by the appropriation which may be made this year. Therefore we have tried all sorts of combinations. We have considered the possibility of an appropriation only to take care of deficits. But if that plan is followed we shall not be carrying out the spirit of

the Act. The only way we can see to meet the situation, to take care of the deficit, and to continue the spirit, the punch, the inspiration, and the vision of this great health program is to continue the appropriation which we have made for the past few years, and upon which our people have relied. That appropriation would be the \$75 million which the distinguished Senator from Alabama is asking, instead of the \$60 million which appears in the Senate committee recommendation, or the \$50 million which appears in the House bill.

So, with all the power at my command, and as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I urge that the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama be adopted.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I merely wish to emphasize the fact that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey is one of the authors of this amendment. We are proud that he is.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am proud to be one of the coauthors.

Mr. HILL. I strongly commend the Senator from New Jersey for the fine speech he has made in support of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator very much. But let me say to him that I look upon the Hill-Burton Act as the child of the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I am delighted to be associated with him. However, he deserves the credit for thinking the problem through and getting us all to work on it when I was on the Senate committee with him. He has been responsible for following through with the program, and for the great success which has attended it. I am glad to pay that tribute to him.

Mr. HILL. I am deeply grateful to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Alabama will receive wholehearted support on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, may we have the yeas and nays?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, during the years I have been a Member of this body I have seen few pieces of legislation enacted which have been productive of a greater amount of permanent good than the Hospital Construction Act, the appropriation for which is now before us. I have seen small hospitals, desperately in need of facilities, grow until they were able to serve their communities. I have seen improvements in public health in every area. I have seen more and more people taking advantage of the facilities which have been offered.

But the work is not yet done. There are still some hospitals, even in my own State, which is a small State, which need to continue the work of improving their facilities and their plants. I think this

work ought to continue at the full level at which it has been carried on until the need is more fully met than it is today. For that reason I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there is nothing I or anyone else could say in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. I could offer the same fervent plea for \$150 million as has been offered by the Senator from Alabama, and other Senators who support the amendment providing a \$15 million increase in the appropriation. There is no question in my mind that during the years since it was first inaugurated, and appropriations have been made for it, the hospital-construction program has been a very worthy one. In 1948 there was appropriated \$75 million. In 1949 another \$75 million was appropriated. In 1950, when we thought we were at peace, we appropriated \$150 million. In 1951 we appropriated another \$75 million. We added to that, by way of a supplemental appropriation, an additional \$10 million. In 1952 we appropriated \$82,500,000. In 1953 we appropriated \$75 million.

I can only say, Mr. President, that the Bureau of the Budget, in its revised budget, requested \$60 million. I presume that they had in mind the terrific burden upon the taxpayers and upon the Treasury of the United States for our national defense. We have the highest employment in the history of the Nation, which has made a great demand upon our manpower. I presume that the Bureau of the Budget had all of those factors in mind when it recommended that for fiscal 1954 the amount of the appropriation should be \$60 million.

As I stated, I could sincerely and honestly advance a plea for even \$150 million, but the Bureau of the Budget, after giving consideration to all the problems with which the Government of the United States is confronted, including the employment and the financial situation, recommended for fiscal 1954 \$60 million.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I was very happy that the subcommittee concurred in recommending \$60 million, and that the full committee supported the recommendation of the subcommittee. In doing so, we support the Bureau of the Budget and the policy of the administration.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I would not be fulfilling my duty were I to disregard the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget and support an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation by \$15 million.

I must consider the fact that the administration has taken all factors into consideration when it made the recommendation.

No one will deny that hospital construction has brought to every community which has been fortunate enough to share in the program, better care for those in need, both medical and physical. I should like to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama and his associates, because my heart is in the program. I would not want to turn a hand in any way to prevent the con-



tinuation of the hospital construction program. Nevertheless, I must support the administration when it states that, in its judgment, considering all the burdens our Nation has upon its shoulders in connection with the national defense, and all its commitments with respect to foreign countries, not more than \$60 million should be appropriated for this purpose. That is the only reason why at this time I am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. Not in heart, but because of the financial question, must I stand against the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think it is proper to tell the Senate at this time something about the work performed by the chairman of a subcommittee on this bill. I am associated with the Senator from Alabama in asking that this appropriation be increased; but, let it not be said that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] the chairman of the subcommittee, was either negligent or unconcerned about this item or any other item in the pending bill. It is a human bill that comes before this body for attention.

I wish to take the opportunity to say a few words in appreciation of the fine work done by the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Minnesota. He is handling the pending bill containing appropriations for the various agencies. The bill has to do with humanity; it has to do with health; it has to do with schools; it has to do with the Children's Bureau, with babies, and with countless other matters affecting the welfare of living persons.

The Senator from Minnesota has shown a deep understanding of all these matters. He has been patient to the extreme in listening to the testimony of witnesses at the hearings. I feel that the Senator from Minnesota has rendered a noble service in connection with this appropriation bill. I appreciate his efforts and work and, even though he is opposed to the amendment, I want Senators to realize the fine understanding and human work done by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, much has been said about the human elements contained in the bill, and I thoroughly agree with what has been said on that point. Much has been said about the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, whom I know. I am aware how he feels about this matter. Much has been said about the need for the health program, to which I heartily subscribe. But very little has been said about the contracts which the Federal Government has entered into in the various States. Unless \$75 million is appropriated, many of the contracts will be violated. I am not going to read the entire letter which I hold in my hand, but shall ask to have all of it printed in the RECORD. It is from the president of the Medical College of South Carolina, and in the letter he says:

The State of South Carolina and its medical college proceeded in full faith in what is believed to be an obligation of the Federal Government. It has had the full cooperative approval of the Federal agencies concerned. Proper and necessary allocations

of funds provided and to be provided were made. Contracts have been made that depend upon full provision of the funds involved in these commitments.

In other words, the State of South Carolina—and the detailed list is given in the letter—has put up \$7,178,000. So far, from Hill-Burton funds, the Federal Government's allocation for hospital construction amounts to \$5,851,201.51. Moreover, the State has made contracts with contractors to finish the work. What will happen? The Legislature of South Carolina has adjourned. How can the work be finished unless \$75 million is provided by Congress? I could refer to some small hospitals in connection with which the Federal Government has entered into contracts. Whether or not the Federal Government had the legal authority to do it before appropriations were made is a question in my mind, but they did it nevertheless. The Senator from Alabama knows that I supported the legislation which he and the former distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. Burton, who was a member of the Appropriations Committee at that time, sponsored. These contracts have been made. How can the Federal Government get out of the contracts. That is what I want to ask the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to say that since the inception of this program, beginning with the passage of the Act of 1946, the program has had no stancher or more loyal supporter than the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. At session after session he has worked very hard for the program; and, of course, he is one of the sponsors of the pending amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama and I submitted in the committee an amendment to increase the fund to \$75 million, but there was a tie vote on that amendment, so it did not carry. Later we submitted an amendment calling for \$60 million, and the committee accepted that amendment.

After a State has put up \$7 million under a program sponsored by the Federal Government, I do not see how the Senate, or the Congress can abdicate its responsibility on the ground that because of the present strain on the finances of the Federal Government, the Bureau of the Budget thinks only \$60 million should be appropriated.

I favor economy, and I have consistently voted for it, but in this case a definite contract is involved.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me at this point?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from South Carolina has said, a definite contract is involved. Unless this amendment is adopted, \$341,724 of Federal funds required under contracts which already have been let will not be available.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. The State Legislature of South Carolina has adjourned, so at this point the State

is dependent upon action by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Dr. Ben F. Wyman, secretary of the South Carolina Board of Health, and State health officer; a letter from Mr. Jacques B. Norman, hospital consultant, of Greenville, S. C.; a letter from Richard G. Roach, president of the American Hospital Association; and a letter from Dr. Kenneth M. Lynch, president of the Medical College of South Carolina.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE  
BOARD OF HEALTH,  
Columbia, May 5, 1953.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: On the 20th day of January 1953, we were notified by the United States Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency that we would have allocated, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1953, the sum of \$1,849,853 for hospital construction.

On the 24th day of April 1953, we received from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, information that the allocation for hospital construction had been severely reduced. This was based on the revised budget estimates now pending before the Congress. They informed us that we would have a reduction of \$391,577 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1953, and ending June 30, 1954.

This is a serious interference with the proposal of the State to construct the teaching hospital at the Medical College of South Carolina. This actually means a loss to the college, in the year mentioned, of \$341,724, as most of the funds received in this fiscal year went to the college.

We simply cannot forego construction of the medical college hospital, and we urge and request that you take the matter up with the necessary dispatch so that the Hill-Burton hospital-construction appropriation will not be reduced from \$75 million to \$60 million.

This has been the topic of some publicity in South Carolina being carried on in the newspapers and quoting Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of the authority.

With kindest personal regards.

Very truly yours,  
BEN F. WYMAN, M. D.,  
State Health Officer.

GREENVILLE, S. C., June 6, 1953.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: This is to confirm telegram of today as follows:

"Cut in Hill-Burton appropriations will be very disastrous to the South Carolina Medical College Teaching Hospital as practically all funds for year 1954 go to this hospital which is under contract. May I urge your support of increase in this appropriation to assist Fairfield, Gaffney, Woodruff, Camden, Orangeburg and others who are planning hospitals.

"In the past 20 years I have worked very close with many Government agencies such as WPA, FWA, PWA, USCNC, etc. Hill-Burton program is far superior to any other program which I attribute to the way the original act was passed and adequate administrative funds. Please give your support to an appropriation sufficient to administer this program.



"During the past 5 years I have been associated with over 30 hospital construction projects in Louisiana, Tennessee, Alabama, South Carolina, Georgia, North Carolina, and Florida. It takes from 2 to 3 years to plan a hospital project hence, State agencies and communities must be able to anticipate future appropriations to properly plan hospitals. Again may I urge consistency in the annual appropriation of \$75 million. If I can help you in this or any other matters please call me."

I hope you will give this serious consideration and effort. It is one program that has the highest public acceptance and one that has rendered a real service to the public. Please let me have your reaction to this.

Kind personal regards,

Cordially yours,

JACQUE B. NORMAN.

GREENVILLE, S. C., June 6, 1953.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Cut in Hill-Burton appropriations will be very disastrous to South Carolina Medical College teaching hospital as practically all funds for year 1954 go to this hospital which is under contract. May I urge your support of increase in this appropriation to assist Fairfield, Gaffney, Woodruff, Camden, Orangeburg, and others who are planning hospitals. In the past 20 years I have worked very close with many Government agencies such as WPA, FWA, TWA, USCNC, etc. Hill-Burton program is far superior to any other program, which I attribute to the way the original act was passed and adequate administrative funds. Please give your support to an appropriation sufficient to administer this program. During the past 5 years I have been associated with over 30 hospital construction projects in Louisiana, Tennessee, Alabama, South Carolina, Georgia, North Carolina, and Florida. It takes from 2 to 3 years to plan a hospital project, hence State agencies and communities must be able to anticipate future appropriation to properly plan hospitals. Again may I urge consistency in the annual appropriation of \$75 million. If I can help you in this or any other matters please call me.

JACQUE B. NORMAN.

ORANGEBURG REGIONAL HOSPITAL,

Orangeburg, S. C., May 16, 1953.

Senator BURNETT R. MAYBANK,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: I have just learned through the American Hospital Association that the administration is recommending that the Hill-Burton appropriation be reduced from \$75 million to \$60 million for 1954.

I feel that the curtailment of this program is not desirable at this time, in that there are many communities in South Carolina still in need of hospital and health facilities. I hope that you will support a minimum of \$75 million appropriation for this most worthy cause.

With best regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD G. ROACH,

Director.

MEDICAL COLLEGE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Charleston, S. C., May 29, 1953.

Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: We are alarmed over the threat of serious reduction of the appropriation related to the hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act, and I wish to present the arguments that impress us as entirely adequate to justify restoration to the full amount anticipated. I am send-

ing two extra copies, for such use as you may desire.

1. The State of South Carolina has appropriated for construction of the medical college hospital and related clinic and laboratory quarters.....

\$4,828,000.00

The State has also appropriated for the purchase of land related to this project.....

100,000.00

It has also passed an act by which the Medical College of South Carolina will borrow for the construction of a related nurses' building about.....

900,000.00

Further, the medical college has let contracts for the construction of a dormitory building, based upon a revenue bond issue purchased by the Federal Housing and Home Agency in an amount of.....

1,000,000.00

Charleston County provided land for the hospital site at a cost of more than.....

350,000.00

All told, the State, Charleston County, and the medical college itself have provided to this project, of which the medical college hospital is the key unit, more than.....

7,178,000.00

The Federal allocations (Hill-Burton) made for the hospital construction amount to.....

5,851,201.51

Furthermore, the city of Charleston, the Medical College Alumni Association, the Medical Society of South Carolina, and the National Cancer Institute have made contributions in money and land of a value of many thousands of dollars.

2. In addition to the highest priority position given to the medical college hospital as the central State unit in the South Carolina hospital-construction plan under the Hill-Burton program, the Medical College Hospital was fully recognized by all authorities and interests concerned as having a very special basis for Federal assistance on the grounds of—

(a) Critical need for additional hospital facilities in this defense area on account of large population increases in personnel of Federal installations located here—Navy yard, air base, Navy minecraft base, and so forth.

(b) Critical need of more doctors, dentists, nurses, and other medical personnel of national level and for actual Federal service. Almost the entire medical and prospective dental products of the medical college are destined by Federal law for immediate military and defense service.

(c) Participation in research in cancer, heart disease, and other pressing health problems, in which the Federal Government is a heavy contributor and in which the medical college is already involved, is planned for expansion in the Medical College Hospital.

(d) The Federal departments also need more dentists as well as doctors, nurses, and medical technicians of all kinds, which completion of the medical college hospital would help to supply.

(e) The State of South Carolina has by law committed itself to the construction and operation of a school of dentistry, the success of which is as dependent upon completion of this hospital as is the increase of doctor production.

(f) Completion of the Medical College Hospital in full is absolutely necessary if the

Medical College shall continue its expanded production of medical personnel and if it shall make the research contribution of which it is capable.

3. The State of South Carolina and its Medical College have proceeded in full faith in what is believed to be an obligation of the Federal Government. It has had the full and cooperative approval of the Federal agencies concerned. Proper and necessary allocations of funds provided and to be provided were made. Contracts have been made that depend upon full provision of the funds involved in these commitments.

It is hardly conceivable that a thorough examination and understanding of the cooperative processes and commitments in this enterprise could result in a conclusion that would halt it at the present stage when actual construction is more than one-half completed or that would jeopardize its full and early fruition.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH M. LYNCH, M. D.,  
President.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, probably 100 other letters on this subject have been sent to me as a member of the Appropriations Committee. I have also received many telegrams on this subject. However, I shall not submit, for printing in the RECORD, all the letters and telegrams; I merely have asked that the four letters to which I have just referred be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The same condition to which the Senator from South Carolina has referred, in speaking of his State, exists in Kentucky. On page 806 of the hearings on the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, are listed 11 hospitals in Kentucky.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am well aware of that, for I discussed the matter with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, both in connection with this bill and the civil functions appropriation bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. So I am quite familiar with this matter.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Kentucky hospitals listed on page 806 of the committee hearings are the following: Good Samaritan Hospital, Lexington; Kings Daughters, Ashland; Ephraim McDowell Memorial, Danville; John Graves Ford Memorial, Georgetown; Bellefonte Hospital, Bellefonte; Campbell County General, Fort Thomas; Hardin County, Elizabethtown; Riverside Hospital, Paducah; Shelby County, Shelbyville; Jewish Hospital, Louisville; Bowling Green-Warren County, Bowling Green.

So I point out that contracts similar to those the Senator from South Carolina has said have been entered into for hospitals in South Carolina, have been entered into for hospitals in Kentucky. If the appropriation of \$75 million is not made, those contracts cannot be met.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is similar to the information I have received from the president of the Medical College of South Carolina, and from medical authorities in several other States. I have also received a telegram from the distinguished editor of Southern Agri-



culture, Dr. Clarence Poe, who is very well known.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the requested increase of \$15 million in this appropriation is very small when we consider how much money the Senate voted to appropriate last week, namely \$5,300,000,000, to be sent to foreign countries. In this case we are proposing an additional appropriation of only \$15 million to care for sick persons in the United States. I have not heard one Senator state or one witness testify that even one of the hospitals being built at the present time is not needed. If any Senator can tell me that too much money is being spent for the construction of hospitals in the United States, I should like to have him do so.

I may state that an additional appropriation of \$15 million for this purpose will enable the people of South Carolina to get out of the very embarrassing situation in which we find ourselves at the present time. Our legislature already has acted, and the program is ready to be proceeded with.

If this additional appropriation is not made, I do not know what we shall do, unless the legislature at its next term makes up the deficit, which is about what the difference will amount to.

Let me say that I have received a letter from Dr. Ben F. Wyman, who is State health officer for South Carolina. In his letter he points out the condition in which we find ourselves at the present time. I ask unanimous consent to have his letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA BOARD OF HEALTH,  
Columbia, May 5, 1953.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: On the 20th day of January, 1953, we were notified by the United States Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency that we would have allocated, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1953, the sum of \$1,849,853 for hospital construction.

On the 24th day of April, 1953, we received, from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, information that the allocation for hospital construction had been severely reduced. This was based on the revised budget estimates now pending before the Congress. They informed us that we would have a reduction of \$391,577 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1953 and ending June 30, 1954.

This is a serious interference with the proposal of the State to construct the Teaching Hospital at the Medical College of South Carolina. This actually means a loss to the college, in the year mentioned, of \$341,724, as most of the funds received in this fiscal year went to the college.

We simply cannot forego construction of the medical college hospital, and we urge and request that you take the matter up with the necessary dispatch so that the Hill-Burton hospital construction appropriation will not be reduced from \$75 million to \$60 million.

This has been the topic of some publicity in South Carolina being carried on in the newspapers and quoting Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of the Authority.

With kindest personal regards.

Very truly yours,

BEN F. WYMAN, M. D.  
State Health Officer.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from South Carolina is one of the authors of the amendment, and he has always been a staunch, loyal friend of this program. He has always been in the front line of the fight for adoption of this program.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Certainly experience has proved that the money which has been spent under the Hill-Burton Act has been spent in localities where it was most needed. For that reason, I have advocated and I have spoken in behalf of the appropriation required for carrying on this work, which I think is very much needed.

So, Mr. President, I wish to let the Senate and the people of the country know that I am in favor of the amendment, and am a coauthor of it.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Alabama has always been a leader in the effort to obtain appropriations for hospital construction. I commend him for what he has done. Certainly we must move forward in this field.

Let me point out that in connection with every war in which we have been engaged, we have found that many millions of our youth have not been physically fit for military service. In many cases proper medical care would enable their physical defects to be corrected, thus enabling them to serve their country in time of war. Thus, Mr. President, this amendment is really a defense measure.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. My colleague has pointed out that no one has denied the great need for the program. Is it not also true that there has been no criticism of the way the program has been administered or of the way the money is being spent? Does not that mean that there is uniform approval throughout the Congress?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have not heard of any criticism about how the money has been spent. No allegations of any sort have been made to the effect that the money has been mis-handled or misused.

Mr. STENNIS. Let me add to what the Senator from South Carolina has said regarding the making of contracts in connection with the program, that in my State several counties and towns are paying interest on bonds which they issued from 3 to 5 years ago. They have been waiting all that time for the appropriation of these funds. Their expenses are accumulating. Certainly it would be false economy not to make the necessary appropriation at this time. Even under the provisions of the amendment, as I understand it, those groups will not be permitted to participate in the program. However, the amendment will hasten the day when they will be permitted to participate in it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like very much to associate myself with the able senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the able Senators from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. JOHNSTON], and the other Senators who are very much in favor of the so-called Hill amendment.

At the present time in Florida nine hospitals are under construction. I have been advised by the Director of the Improvement Commission that unless the additional \$15 million is made available—of course that additional amount will be distributed among all the States—not only will we not have new hospital facilities, but the hospitals now being constructed will not be completed; their construction will have to be suspended. That will cause great waste to the Federal Government and also to the people of Florida.

My State is growing rapidly. More people come to Florida every week and every month. If we have one specific need, it is the need for additional hospital beds.

So I am very happy to associate myself with the Senator from Alabama, the Senators from South Carolina, and the other Senators who are in favor of the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Florida always is of great assistance in connection with matters of this kind.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I received from Dr. Kenneth M. Lynch, president of the Medical College of South Carolina. In his telegram he explains how the building of the medical college hospital project will be jeopardized if the additional amount is not appropriated.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLESTON S. C., May 2, 1953.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,  
United States Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Beg to call your attention to Secretary Hobby's statement to House Appropriations Subcommittee and your support for her plea against reduction of Hill-Burton hospital construction appropriation from previous seventy-five million to sixty million as this reduction would slash \$341,724 allotted to Medical College Hospital project now under contract and construction and thereby jeopardize its completion.

KENNETH M. LYNCH, M. D.,  
President, Medical College of South  
Carolina.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the Senator from Alabama and the other sponsors of the amendment. The Senator from Alabama knows that for a number of years, when these items have come before the Senate, I have supported the Hill-Burton Act and the expansion of our hospital program.

Mr. President, I said earlier this afternoon on this floor, in supporting an



amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], that we have been voting billions of dollars in foreign aid and for divers and sundry other activities and matters that are important, or that seem to be important. So it is not going to hurt my conscience to support the pending amendment, and to support it wholeheartedly in the interest of better hospitalization and in the interest of expanded hospital facilities, not only in my section of the country, but also in the entire Nation.

I took the trouble to make a little survey in my State to ascertain what the attitude of the people might be and what the discouraging effects might be in the event the original amount requested were cut. I have in my hand 10 communications which I have received from different sections of my State, which I think very clearly set forth the need for the appropriation, the need of supporting the amendment now before the Senate, and the need of passing the pending bill as amended. I ask unanimous consent that, as part of my remarks, there be printed in the RECORD at this point the letters to which I have referred and which I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOUNT CARMEL HOSPITAL AND  
SCHOOL OF NURSING,  
Pittsburg, Kans., June 27, 1953.

Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPPEL: We of the Hospitals of the Sisters of St. Joseph are greatly alarmed at the proposed \$25 million slash in Hill-Burton Act funds for relieving the critical need for additional hospital beds. We believe you will share this anxiety when you learn, as we did, that to meet the urgent need for additional hospital beds in critical areas of Kansas and to carry out the businesslike State plan of hospital construction of the Kansas State Board of Health, sufficient Federal funds must be enacted. This Federal aid can be provided only by the Hill-Burton Act.

Some locations in Kansas are desperately in need of hospital expansion and are now running well over 100-percent occupancy. This is true particularly in Wichita, Lawrence, and Kansas City.

We hope you will confer with Senator BRIDGES and other members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to which the House-adopted Hill-Burton Act funds slash has been referred, and call their attention to the urgent need for additional hospital beds in critical areas. The health of Kansas and the Nation is at stake.

Sincerely,

Sister M. ANGELA,  
Administrator.

PRATT COUNTY HOSPITAL,  
Pratt, Kans.

Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPPEL: We of the Hospitals of the Sisters of St. Joseph are greatly alarmed at the proposed \$25 million slash in Hill-Burton Act funds for relieving the critical need for additional hospital beds. We believe you will share this anxiety when you

learn—as we did—that to meet the urgent need for additional hospital beds in critical areas of Kansas and to carry out the businesslike State Plan of Hospital Construction of the Kansas State Board of Health, sufficient Federal funds must be enacted. This Federal aid can be provided only by the Hill-Burton Act.

1. The Kansas Advisory Hospital Council has been notified that cutting the proposed \$75 million Hill-Burton Act budget to \$50 million, as was done by the House, will limit grants in Kansas during 1954 to about \$667,000, compared to \$812,847 allocated this State during the past year.

2. This serious cutback will prevent construction of any new hospitals in Kansas being started next year. Thus, those communities which are planning to relieve their bed shortages will be stopped before they get going.

3. In some communities where local funds have been raised to match Hill-Burton Act funds on a 60-40 split, hospital projects will be abandoned or postponed because of insufficient Federal aid. This, in effect, will constitute a broken pledge by the United States Government.

4. Some of the places desperately in need of hospital expansion are Wichita, Lawrence, and Kansas City, Kans. Because Wichita is one of the fastest growing cities in the Nation and because the area which the Wichita hospitals serve supersedes county and State boundaries, the hospitals are critically overcrowded. In fact, St. Joseph Hospital in Wichita has an average bed occupancy of 103 percent. Similar situations exist in Lawrence and Kansas City, Kans.

5. The plight of hospitals in Wichita, in Kansas and in the entire United States—where an acute shortage of 848,567 hospital beds exists, according to United States Public Health Service standards—can largely be remedied by restoration of the Hill-Burton Act hospital fund appropriation to the originally proposed budget figure of \$75 million.

We hope you will confer with Senator BRIDGES and other members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to which the House-adopted Hill-Burton Act funds slash has been referred, and call their attention to the urgent need for additional hospital beds in critical areas. The health of Kansas and the Nation is at stake.

Sincerely,

Sister M. ETHELDREDA,  
Administrator.

BOB WILSON MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,  
Ulysses, Kans., June 25, 1953.  
Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPPEL: I should like to appeal to you in behalf of our hospitals in Kansas concerning the proposed House cut in the Hill-Burton Act funds which relieves or would help relieve the critical need for additional hospital beds. We believe you feel as we do that the critical bed shortage can only be relieved with the aid of Federal funds.

The bed capacity in the hospitals of Kansas has been overcrowded beyond description. The proposed slash would hinder greatly Federal aid for hospital expansion, a program so necessary to our communities today. The situation in Kansas is critical, and this may be fully realized in one of our own hospitals—St. Joseph's in Wichita, where the bed shortage has affected that community for the past 2 years.

According to United States Public Health Service standards, an acute shortage of 848,567 hospital beds now exists in the United States. Surely you can realize our great concern over the proposed \$25 million cut which has been referred to your committee. Should this be approved, those communities which

are planning to relieve their bed shortage by construction within the next year would greatly feel the effects of such action and, in all probability, would not be able to proceed with their plans.

I sincerely hope you will confer with Senator BRIDGES and other members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to which the House-adopted Hill-Burton Act funds slash has been referred, urging them to realize the dire need for additional beds in the hospitals of Kansas. The committee's action to restore the Hill-Burton budget figure to \$75 million may have its effect upon the health of our Nation.

Sincerely yours,

Sister M. BERNICE,  
Administrator.

ELLINWOOD DISTRICT HOSPITAL,  
Ellinwood, Kans., June 25, 1953.

Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPPEL: We of the Hospitals of the Sisters of St. Joseph are greatly alarmed at the proposed \$25 million slash in Hill-Burton Act funds for relieving the critical need for additional hospital beds. We believe you will share this anxiety when you learn—as we did—that to meet the urgent need for additional hospital beds in critical areas of Kansas and to carry out the businesslike State Plan of Hospital Construction of the Kansas State Board of Health, sufficient Federal funds must be enacted. This Federal aid can be provided only by the Hill-Burton Act.

1. The Kansas Advisory Hospital Council has been notified that cutting the proposed \$75 million, Hill-Burton Act budget to \$50 million, as was done by the House, will limit grants to Kansas during 1954 to about \$667,000, compared to \$816,847 allocated this State during the past year.

2. This serious cutback will prevent construction of any new hospitals in Kansas being started next year. Thus, those communities which are planning to relieve their bed shortages will be stopped before they get going.

3. In some communities where local funds have been raised to match Hill-Burton Act funds on a 60-40 split, hospital projects will be abandoned or postponed because of insufficient Federal aid. This, in effect, will constitute a broken pledge by the United States Government.

4. Some of the places desperately in need of hospital expansion are Wichita, Lawrence and Kansas City, Kans. Because Wichita is one of the fastest growing areas in the Nation and because the territory which the Wichita Hospitals serve supersedes county and State boundaries, the hospitals are critically overcrowded. In fact, St. Joseph Hospital in Wichita has an average bed capacity of 103 percent. Similar situations exist in Lawrence and Kansas City, Kans.

5. The plight of hospitals in Wichita, in Kansas and in the entire United States—where an acute shortage of 848,567 hospital beds exists, according to United States Public Health Service standards—can largely be remedied by restoration of the Hill-Burton Act hospital fund appropriation to the originally proposed budget figure of \$75 million.

We hope that you will confer with Senator BRIDGES and other members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to which the House-adopted Hill-Burton Act funds slash has been referred, and call their attention to the urgent need for additional hospital beds in critical areas. The health of Kansas and of the Nation is at stake.

Sincerely,

Sister M. ROSALIE,  
Administrator.



WICHITA ST. JOSEPH HOSPITAL,  
Wichita, Kans., June 24, 1953.

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPPEL: We of the Hospitals of the Sisters of St. Joseph are greatly alarmed at the proposed \$25 million slash in Hill-Burton Act funds for relieving the critical need for more hospital beds. We believe you will share this anxiety when you learn—as we did—that sufficient Federal funds must be enacted if the urgent need for additional hospital beds in critical areas of Kansas is to be met, and if the businesslike State Plan of Hospital Construction of the Kansas State Board of Health is to be carried out.

We have been advised that the Kansas Advisory Hospital Council has been notified that cutting the proposed \$75 million Hill-Burton Act budget to \$50 million, as was done by the House, will limit grants in Kansas during 1954 to about \$667,000, compared to \$812,847 allocated our State during the past year.

This serious cutback will prevent construction of any new hospitals in Kansas being started next year. Thus, those communities which are planning to relieve their bed shortages will be stopped before they get going.

In some communities where local funds have been raised to match Hill-Burton Act funds, hospital projects will be abandoned or postponed because of insufficient Federal aid. This, in effect, will constitute a broken pledge by the United States Government.

Three cities in Kansas desperately in need of hospital expansion are Wichita, Lawrence, and Kansas City. The hospitals in Wichita are critically overcrowded because the city is one of the fastest growing in the United States and because the area the hospitals in Wichita serve know no State or county boundaries. In fact, St. Joseph Hospital in Wichita, of which I am the administrator, this year has an average bed occupancy of 103 percent. That means we never have enough beds to meet the demand. Similar situations exist in other Wichita hospitals and in Lawrence and Kansas City.

For these reasons, we hope you will confer with Senator BRIDGES and other members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to which the Hill-Burton Act has been referred, and point out the urgent need for additional hospital beds in critical areas of Kansas.

Yours truly,  
Sister M. ANTHONY, Administrator.

MERCY HOSPITAL,  
Parsons, Kans., June 26, 1953.

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPPEL: We of the Hospitals of the Sisters of St. Joseph are greatly alarmed at the proposed \$25 million slash in Hill-Burton Act funds for relieving the critical need for additional hospital beds. We believe you will share this anxiety when you learn—as we did—that to meet the urgent need for additional hospital beds in critical areas of Kansas and to carry out the businesslike State plan of hospital construction of the Kansas State Board of Health, sufficient Federal funds must be enacted. This Federal aid can be provided only by the Hill-Burton Act.

1. The Kansas Advisory Hospital Council has been notified that cutting the proposed \$75 million Hill-Burton Act budget to \$50 million, as was done by the House, will limit grants in Kansas during 1954 to about \$667,000, compared to \$812,847 allocated to this State during the past year.

2. This serious cutback will prevent construction of any new hospitals in Kansas being started next year. Thus, those communities which are planning to relieve their

bed shortages will be stopped before they get going.

3. In some communities where local funds have been raised to match Hill-Burton Act funds on a 60-40 split, hospital projects will be abandoned or postponed because of insufficient Federal aid. This, in effect, will constitute a broken pledge by the United States Government.

4. Some of the places desperately in need of hospital expansion are Wichita, Lawrence, and Kansas City, Kans. Because Wichita is one of the fastest growing cities in the Nation and because the area which the Wichita hospitals serve supersedes county and State boundaries, the hospitals are critically overcrowded. In fact, St. Joseph Hospital in Wichita has an average bed occupancy of 103 percent. Similar situations exist in Lawrence and Kansas City, Kans.

5. The plight of hospitals in Wichita, in Kansas, and in the entire United States—where an acute shortage of 848,567 hospital beds exists, according to United States Public Health Service standards—can largely be remedied by restoration of the Hill-Burton Act hospital fund appropriation to the originally proposed budget figure of \$75 million.

We hope you will confer with Senator BRIDGES and other members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to which the House-adopted Hill-Burton Act funds slash has been referred, and call their attention to the urgent need for additional hospital beds in critical areas. The health of Kansas and the Nation is at stake.

Sincerely,  
Mother M. BAPTISTA.

ST. ANTHONY HOSPITAL  
AND SCHOOL OF NURSING,  
Dodge City, Kans., June 25, 1953.

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPPEL: We, of the Hospitals of the Sisters of St. Joseph, are greatly alarmed at the proposed \$25-million slash in Hill-Burton Act funds for relieving the critical need for additional hospital beds. We believe you will share this anxiety when you learn—as we did—that to meet the urgent need for additional hospital beds in critical areas of Kansas and to carry out the businesslike State Plan of Hospital Construction of the Kansas State Board of Health, sufficient Federal funds must be enacted. This Federal aid can be provided only by the Hill-Burton Act.

1. The Kansas Advisory Hospital Council has been notified that cutting the proposed \$75 million Hill-Burton Act budget to \$50 million, as was done by the House, will limit grants in Kansas during 1954 to about \$667,000, compared to \$812,847 allocated this State during the past year.

2. This serious cutback will prevent construction of any new hospitals in Kansas being started next year. Thus, those communities which are planning to relieve their bed shortages will be stopped before they get going.

3. In some communities where local funds have been raised to match Hill-Burton Act funds on a 60-40 split, hospital projects will be abandoned or postponed because of insufficient Federal aid. This, in effect, will constitute a broken pledge by the United States Government.

4. Some of the places desperately in need of hospital expansion are Wichita, Lawrence, and Kansas City, Kans. Because Wichita is one of the fastest growing cities in the Nation and because the area which the Wichita hospitals serve supersedes county and State boundaries, the hospitals are critically overcrowded. In fact, St. Joseph Hospital in Wichita has an average bed occupancy of 103 percent. Similar situations exist in Lawrence and Kansas City, Kans.

5. The plight of hospitals in Wichita, in Kansas, and in the entire United States—where an acute shortage of 848,567 hospital beds exists, according to United States Public Health Service standards—can largely be remedied by restoration of the Hill-Burton Act hospital fund appropriation to the originally proposed budget figure of \$75 million.

We hope you will confer with Senator BRIDGES and other members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to which the House-adopted Hill-Burton Act funds slash has been referred, and call their attention to the urgent need for additional hospital beds in critical areas. The health of Kansas and the Nation is at stake.

Sincerely,  
Sister M. THEODORE,  
Administrator.

ST. MARY'S HOSPITAL,  
Winfield, Kans., June 26, 1953.

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPPEL: We of the hospitals of the Sisters of St. Joseph are greatly alarmed at the proposed \$25 million slash in Hill-Burton Act funds for relieving the critical need for additional hospital beds. We believe you will share this anxiety when you learn, as we did, that to meet the urgent need for additional hospital beds in critical areas of Kansas and to carry out the businesslike State Plan of Hospital Construction of the Kansas State Board of Health, sufficient Federal funds must be enacted. This Federal aid can be provided only by the Hill-Burton Act.

1. The Kansas Advisory Hospital Council has been notified that cutting the proposed \$75 million Hill-Burton Act budget to \$50 million, as was done by the House, will limit grants in Kansas during 1954 to about \$667,000, compared to \$812,847 allocated this State during the past year.

2. This serious cutback will prevent construction of any new hospitals in Kansas being started next year. Thus, those communities which are planning to relieve their bed shortages will be stopped before they get going.

3. In some communities where local funds have been raised to match Hill-Burton Act funds on a 60-40 split, hospital projects will be abandoned or postponed because of insufficient Federal aid. This, in effect, will constitute a broken pledge by the United States Government.

4. Some of the places desperately in need of hospital expansion are Wichita, Lawrence, and Kansas City, Kans. Because Wichita is one of the fastest growing cities in the Nation and because the area which the Wichita hospitals serve supersedes county and State boundaries, the hospitals are critically overcrowded. In fact, St. Joseph Hospital in Wichita has an average bed occupancy of 103 percent. Similar situations exist in Lawrence and Kansas City, Kans.

5. The plight of hospitals in Wichita, in Kansas, and in the entire United States—where an acute shortage of 848,567 hospital beds exists, according to United States Public Health Service standards—can largely be remedied by restoration of the Hill-Burton Act hospital fund appropriation to the originally proposed budget figure of \$75 million.

We hope you will confer with Senator BRIDGES and other members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to which the House-adopted Hill-Burton Act funds slash has been referred, and call their attention to the urgent need for additional hospital beds in critical areas. The health of Kansas and the Nation is at stake.

Sincerely,  
Sister MARY AGNES,  
Administrator.



HOSPITALS OF SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH,  
Wichita, Kans., June 19, 1953.  
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPPEL: We of the Hospitals of the Sisters of St. Joseph are greatly alarmed at the proposed \$25 million slash in Hill-Burton Act funds for relieving the critical need for additional hospital beds. We believe you will share this anxiety when you learn—as we did—that to meet the urgent need for additional hospital beds in critical areas of Kansas and to carry out the businesslike State Plan of Hospital Construction of the Kansas State Board of Health, sufficient Federal funds must be enacted. This Federal aid can be provided only by the Hill-Burton Act.

1. The Kansas Advisory Hospital Council, of which I am a member, has been notified that cutting the proposed \$75 million Hill-Burton Act budget to \$50 million, as was done by the House will limit grants in Kansas during 1954 to about \$667,000, compared to \$812,847 allocated this State during the past year.

2. This serious cutback will prevent construction of any new hospitals in Kansas being started next year. Thus, those communities which are planning to relieve their bed shortages will be stopped before they get going.

3. In some communities where local funds have been raised to match Hill-Burton Act funds on a 60-40 split, hospital projects will be abandoned or postponed because of insufficient Federal aid. This, in effect, will constitute a broken pledge by the United States Government.

4. Some of the places desperately in need of hospital expansion are Wichita, Lawrence, and Kansas City, Kans. Because Wichita is one of the fastest growing cities in the Nation and because the area which the Wichita hospitals serve supersedes county and State boundaries, the hospitals are critically overcrowded. In fact, St. Joseph Hospital in Wichita has an average bed occupancy of 103 percent. Similar situations exist in Lawrence and Kansas City, Kans.

5. The plight of hospitals in Wichita, in Kansas, and in the entire United States—where an acute shortage of 848,567 hospital beds exists, according to United States Public Health Service standards—can largely be remedied by restoration of the Hill-Burton Act hospital fund appropriation to the originally proposed budget figure of \$75 million.

We hope you will confer with Senator BRIDGES and other members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to which the House-adopted Hill-Burton Act funds slash has been referred, and call their attention to the urgent need for additional hospital beds in critical areas. The health of Kansas and the Nation is at stake.

Sincerely,

L. E. STOLZ,  
General Business Manager.

METZLER FURNITURE CO.,  
Paola, Kans., May 28, 1953.

Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPPEL: I have watched with interest your work in the Senate. We have been proud of you and your work. Thank you for your independence.

I write in the matter of shearing the budget so heavily in the proposed appropriation for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act. Seems the bill coming out of the Ways and Means Committee now wants to reduce this budget item by almost a third.

We had just gotten a start in building long-needed hospitals over the country. They are so expensive that they will not be built without Federal grants.

There would be no one hurt if you would reduce the amount of money that our country will give to foreign aid by \$1 billion. Surely our own people should not be cut any larger percentage than the budget for foreign giveaway is reduced.

Foreign countries all hate us anyway, and even France and England are doing everything to thwart what President "Ike" is trying to do bring about an honorable peace. Why cast our pearls to the swine? Why not take care of our sick and poor at home a little now?

Hope you will work to restore this item in the budget as it should be. We will thank you for it.

Sincerely,

L. F. METZLER,  
Committeeman, Fourth Ward.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Alabama for having brought this matter to the attention of the Senate, and upon the able manner in which he has presented it. I shall vote for the amendment, because I think it is a practical approach to the solution of our hospital problem.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to join with other Senators in urging the support of the very important amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Alabama. Throughout the time I have served on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have been deeply interested in legislation of this sort, and I have always found the Senator from Alabama taking the lead in support of the hospital program.

I do not believe there is anything I could say today which would add to the arguments already presented in justification of the amendment proposing to increase the appropriation. Certainly nothing has been said to justify its defeat. I need not attempt to restate the importance of the hospital construction program, nor need I advise the Senate with reference to the excellence of the local, State, and Federal relationships which have developed under its administration. That has been discussed at some length during the course of the debate this afternoon. These things are well known. They cannot be questioned.

The only issue before the Senate is the issue of blind, reckless, and wasteful "economy" on the one hand, and intelligent, purposeful planning for the general welfare on the other. On this issue, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to two factors worthy of their consideration.

The first is that, thanks to the ill-conceived hard-money policy of the Treasury, a round of interest rate increases has already occurred. This, in the opinion of competent observers, may well have a stifling effect on many phases of our economy within the next several months. If so, certainly the construction industry and workers in the building trades will be among the first to be hit. I understand, too, that the White House has a staff at work trying to plan measures to be invoked should a business recession set in. Certainly the construction of needed hospitals would be part of any such program. I would suggest, therefore, that, wholly apart from the intrinsic values of our hospital-construction

program, this is no time to make cuts in a building-construction program of proved value.

The second point I should like to make in connection with this so-called "economy" move involves a simple declaration of principle. If this Republican Congress wants to economize in a truly intelligent way; if it wants to lower the tax burden and increase our revenues through measures which will not cost us more in the long run than they appear to save at first glance, then I am ready to cooperate to the fullest extent. If, instead of giving away our natural resources, we start to develop them in the interest of all the taxpayers and to the advantage of the entire Nation, that would mean true economy. Such economy I would favor 100 percent.

But if the leadership of this Congress means to carry out its ill-conceived campaign pledges of economy in Government at the expense of the American people, and particularly if it is to be at the expense of rural areas where Hill-Burton hospitals are planned, and are so badly needed, so be it. I, for one, shall have no part in wielding the budget-slashing economy knife if it is going to drip with the blood of a farm child whose life might have been saved had we carried out our pledge to help build hospitals where, in the opinion of the States themselves, they are unquestionably needed.

I would prefer, of course, that we appropriate the entire \$150 million authorized in the carefully drafted, thoroughly considered Hill-Burton Act. The very least we can do is to vote for the \$75 million appropriation which I believe the States have a right to expect of us as a minimum. I urge support of the amendment.

I certainly hope the amendment of the Senator from Alabama will be agreed to, because, in my judgment, it relates to one of the most important matters before the Senate today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	McCarthy
Anderson	Hayden	McClellan
Barrett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Beall	Hennings	Monroney
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bush	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Holland	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd	Jackson	Payne
Capehart	Jenner	Potter
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Purtell
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cooper	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smathers
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Ellender	Lehman	Symington
Ferguson	Long	Thye
Flanders	Magnuson	Tobey
George	Malone	Watkins
Gillette	Mansfield	Williams
Goldwater	Martin	Young
Gore	Maybank	
Green	McCarran	



The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama for himself and other Senators, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to speak in opposition to the Hill amendment and to state the reasons for my opposition.

When the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], former Senator Burton, and a number of other Senators joined in securing the enactment of the hospital construction legislation I was a sponsor of it and have supported it since coming to the Senate. But here we have a situation where the committee's recommendation is already \$10 million above the amount allowed by the House of Representatives. It is now \$60 million, which is the amount recommended in the revised budget submitted to Congress by the President of the United States.

I have no doubt, Mr. President, that an argument could be made for the amount in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama, who I know is very sincerely interested in this subject, as are other Members of the Senate. It is a very appealing subject. An amendment could be offered for a considerably increased amount over and beyond that which is contained in the pending amendment and a strong argument could be made for it. But I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that we are operating on borrowed money. The national debt is in excess of \$265 billion. Despite the reductions which have been proposed in the several appropriation bills which have been passed, we ended the fiscal year, which closed on June 30, with a deficiency of approximately \$9 billion. Even with the reductions which have been proposed, it is quite possible that next year may end with a deficiency and with the budget out of balance.

The American people are now bearing the highest tax burden in the history of the country, and it is questionable whether the Senate or the House will do any more than to extend the present tax legislation. Certainly, Mr. President, I doubt that anyone really believes there can be brought forth any tax legislation calling for increases over the presently existing high rates. I believe the Senate of the United States and the Congress will have to face up to the very real budgetary problem which is confronting the Nation. The security of the country is involved; not only the security of the country from the point of view of national defense, but the security of the country from the point of view of the stability of our currency and of the credit of the Nation.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the chairman of the subcommittee, has today accepted a number of amendments in order to correct what some of the Members felt were reductions over and beyond those recommended by the Budget Bureau. But I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that that is not the case with this amendment. The amount which is pro-

posed by the committee is precisely the amount which was recommended by the Budget Bureau. It is not a reduction in that amount.

I think a sense of responsibility with regard to the budget problem which is facing the Nation would require that the amendment be not accepted at this time. If, in the course of the next 6 or 8 months the dangers incident to the foreign situation should lessen, and we can cut the enormous defense expenditures and bring the budget into balance, the administration may present to the Congress of the United States a supplemental bill to carry on not only this program but many other programs in which all of us would like to join. But now the money is not being voted out of excess funds in the Treasury; it is coming out of additional borrowing. We are living on borrowed money.

Under those circumstances, Mr. President, it seems to me the Senate should uphold its Appropriations Committee, uphold the Director of the Budget, and not increase the appropriation by an additional \$15 million.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, one Senator speaking this afternoon in behalf of the amendment said that, in one way, this was not a bad program. That is exactly correct. I sat through all the debate this afternoon, and I did not hear anyone say the hospital construction program was a bad program. No one rose in the Senate and objected to it. Every Senator who spoke, regardless of his particular approach, spoke of it as a good program. It is a program in which all of us believe, and which all of us have supported from time to time.

But when we come to the question of the budget, the issue is not whether a program is a good or a bad one. One may have a wholly good program, but sooner or later it is necessary to decide how much is to be spent on the program. There comes a time when a decision must be made.

Every person in his own financing arrives at a point where he says, "I would like to have a new car. I would like to buy a new house. I would like to buy a new suit." But once in a while he comes to a point where he must say, "I cannot do it at this particular time."

As the acting majority leader has said, we have arrived at a point where we are pushing the debt limit. At some point we shall have to make cuts. Economy means nothing if we apply it to things we do not need. Economy means something if we apply it to things we need.

As was pointed out earlier in the debate, Congress has never appropriated less than \$75 million for this program. Once it was \$75 million; one time it was \$85 million; one time it was \$150 million.

The most urgent phases of the program ought to be underway in most of the States, and I believe they are. The particular appeal which has been made for increasing the budget estimate and the committee recommendation on this particular item today is that some States find themselves in a difficult position, because they have been adopting a practice which, while never banned by law, at least was not contemplated when the

basic Hill-Burton Act was passed; that is, they have operated under the split-project method. Instead of making allocations to complete the hospital program, some 32 States have adopted the method of making allocations for the amount of money which was expected to be needed for bills which were maturing on hospital projects in a particular year.

Possibly it is true that it is necessary to begin more hospital projects, but there has never been any statement in the act or by anyone responsible for administering the act on the part of the Federal Government that if the States followed the split-project method, they could commit the Federal Government in the next year to appropriate enough to carry on the program for the vast number of projects that may be started.

Sixteen States have not adopted the split-project method, because they saw the penalties involved. They saw that a time might come when Congress might not appropriate sufficient money to allow allocations for all the projects which might be started.

Personally, I think there ought to be a clear-cut statement of policy by the Federal Government. Either all States ought to be permitted to adopt the split-project method, and to get a number of partially built hospitals, with a moral commitment on the part of the Federal Government, or at least an implied moral commitment, to provide enough money to take care of all the projects that might be started, or none of the States should be so favored. However, until that is done, the Federal Government does not have an obligation to make an appropriation to carry on all projects that may be started.

The committee report very well says:

The committee feels that the Public Health Service should restudy the split-project method of financing. It feels very strongly that should such method be continued, there must be a clear understanding that this does not constitute a moral commitment for the Congress to provide additional funds and that the local sponsors may start building only with the understanding that they may have to provide the full amount necessary to complete the projects.

Certainly at present there is no moral commitment on the part of the Federal Government to appropriate enough money to make an allocation for all hospitals which may have been started under the split-project method, when the Federal Government is not itself a party to determining what allocations should be or what projects should be built.

I do not believe there is a Member of the Senate who would not like to vote for this amendment. There is not a Member of the Senate who would not like to vote for more than \$75 million. There is not a Member of the Senate who would not like to vote for the full \$150 million provided by the basic authorization. But if our statements about economy and about trying to balance the budget mean anything, once in a while it is necessary to put an end to going above budget estimates, even for projects such as these, much as we would like to have them.



It seems to me, since an opportunity to vote is presented, that in this case Senators who believe in balancing the budget will have an opportunity to stay with a balanced budget, and to vote "no" on the amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the amount recommended by the Senate committee is \$27,729,000 over the amount appropriated by the House. This afternoon we have added to that amount, by amendments already accepted, \$3,035,000. That makes it practically \$30 million above the House bill.

Mr. President, again I must call attention to the fact that at the outset, in 1948, \$75 million was appropriated for hospital construction. In 1949, a similar amount was appropriated. In 1950, when we thought we were at peace with the world, we appropriated \$150 million to proceed with hospital construction.

When the Korean war compelled the Nation to make heavy defense expenditures, Congress then reduced the amount to \$75 million. In the years 1951 and 1952 Congress appropriated \$82,500,000. For the fiscal 1953 the amount was \$75 million.

As I said earlier, I believe the Budget Bureau took into consideration the Nation's financial responsibility, its unbalanced budget, and the high taxes imposed upon taxpayers, and they considered they were justified in reducing the hospital construction program to \$60 million, which is the amount the Senate Committee on Appropriations has recommended to the Senate.

I can only say to Senators that if they raise this appropriation another \$15 million, they will be going for above the amount recommended by the Budget Bureau.

For that reason, even though I strongly favor the law, and, in fact, would like to see appropriated the maximum amount authorized, \$150 million, I feel that since we are engaged in huge defense expenditures, I must support the Budget Bureau. Therefore, since the yeas and nays have been ordered, I shall vote "nay" on the amendment, even though I should desire to speak in support of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have grave doubt whether Congress actually wants to balance the budget. I feel a sense of frustration over the experience I have had on the Committee on Appropriations. I serve on five subcommittees, and I believe Senator who are associated with me in that endeavor will bear me out when I say that I have made repeated efforts to cut all along the line, but have failed more often than I have succeeded. As a matter of fact, my failures in that respect show a score of almost 100 percent. I have just about given up, reluctant as I am to say so, in my efforts to cut or chisel some money from the budget estimates, in the hope that we can march in the direction of a balanced budget.

Let me say to the sponsors of the amendment that if this particular amendment is placed on the basis of need, they should not be so picayunish. They might as well make the sky the

limit. I sat and heard the testimony as to the estimated deficit in beds over the country. Witnesses said to the committee, "We need from 733,000 to 850,000 beds." If this proposal is put on the basis of need today, then let us make the sky the limit. Let us put in \$150 million or \$200 million. Let us put in all that is necessary in every section of the country, notwithstanding the fact that there is much good private testimony which suggests that the entire program ought to be evaluated.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not for the moment. In the first place, we can get plenty of adequate and authentic testimony to the effect that people do not stay in hospitals as long as they once did. I am wondering whether or not the entire program should be evaluated.

I come back to the basic premise, namely, that either we are going to give some consideration to a balanced budget or we are not. Certainly we shall be held accountable by the people of the country. Evidently the budget is going to be out of balance in the fiscal year 1954. I am not so bold as to prophesy or predict what the condition will be in the fiscal year 1955. However, I will say to the sponsors of the amendment that I am not insensible of the fact that in the past 22 years the budget has been balanced only twice. That was in the 80th Congress. We balanced it in 1947 and 1948. I was on the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives at the time.

We heard no great squawking from the people of the country because we denied a good many desirable things, things which everyone knew were desirable. But we must cut the cloth to suit the purse.

We balanced the budget in the 80th Congress. Along with the balanced budget we earmarked \$3 billion the first year of the 80th Congress for the mutual-security program or the Marshall program. We then gave the taxpayers a little flip, as a matter of an appreciative gesture, I suppose. But it was a demonstration that at a time like that it could be done. However, it will not be done this time unless there is a will in Congress to do it. It will not be done unless there is a determination to stand up against every clamor and say, "Desirable as it may be, there is a larger duty, and that duty is to the solvency of the country." That is the question that is involved here.

I tried to keep increases from coming into the bill. I voted against them. I voted against the increases represented in the pending bill. I voted against the increase for the National Health Service, and other desirable items.

I should like to see a record of something a little more tangible. Since 1944 we have spent \$141 million on cancer research. I am not so sure but that the Kettering-Sloan Foundation, with a modest amount, has shown better results in researches in the field of leukemia cancer than we have shown in the Government. We have stockpiled a great many technicians and scientists. We have constructed a great many buildings.

But people are still dying of this dread disease. It seems to me that we should see a few more tangible results as a consequence of the work done from 1944 to 1953, a period of 9 years, with an expenditure of \$141 million.

I voted against this particular increase. I know that there will be clamor and I know that there will be a scolding, but that will not make a particle of difference to me, because I think we have reached that point in our national life where we are either going to attain solvency and roll back the inflationary fevers which are the direct and proximate result of deficit spending, or we will simply let it go down the drain.

So I intend to resist this proposal, along with all other amendments for increases, as my modest contribution to Federal solvency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for himself and other Senators. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. GILLETTE (after having voted in the negative). I had forgotten that I have a pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. I understand that if he were present and voting he would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business. If present and voting the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 41, as follows:

#### YEAS—43

Aiken	Hennings	Langer
Anderson	Hill	Lehman
Chavez	Hoey	Magnuson
Clements	Humphrey	Mansfield
Cooper	Jackson	Maybank
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	McCarran
Duff	Johnston, S. C.	McClellan
George	Kefauver	Monroney
Gore	Kennedy	Morsey
Green	Kerr	Murray
Hayden	Kilgore	Neely



Pastore	Smathers	Symington
Payne	Smith, N. J.	Tobey
Russell	Sparkman	
Schoeppel	Stennis	

## NAYS—41

Barrett	Ellender	Martin
Beall	Ferguson	McCarthy
Bennett	Flanders	Millikin
Bricker	Goldwater	Mundt
Bush	Griswold	Potter
Butler, Md.	Hendrickson	Purtell
Butler, Nebr.	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Byrd	Holland	Saltonstall
Capehart	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Thye
Case	Knowland	Watkins
Cordon	Kuchel	Williams
Dirksen	Long	Young
Dworshak	Malone	

## NOT VOTING—11

Bridges	Fulbright	Taft
Daniel	Gillette	Welker
Eastland	Hunt	Wiley
Frear	Ives	

So the amendment offered by Mr. HILL for himself and other Senators was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DUFF in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "\$6,250,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$6,750,000."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the reason for offering the amendment is not that I do not have the greatest admiration and respect for the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who heard testimony in connection with this bill particularly on behalf of the requirements for funds in the Wage and Hour Division, but rather because of the fact that the amount recommended is considerably below the amount which President Eisenhower recommended in the budget request submitted to Congress.

As I refer to the record in connection with the hearings before the committee, I note with a great deal of interest the report which was made by the Hoover Commission with regard to the effectiveness of this particular division of the Labor Department, and I am concerned that reducing the funds for the operation of the division to the extent recommended by the committee will result in a curtailment of the work of a very effective division of the Labor Department.

Mr. President, no one, after reviewing the facts, has been more concerned about economy and making effective budget reductions wherever possible than the Secretary of Labor, as is evidenced by the recommendations contained in the budget submitted to Congress. It is my hope, therefore, that the amendment offered by me may be given favorable consideration, because it will place the amount available for the Wage and Hour

Division of the Department of Labor halfway between the amount recommended by the Committee on Appropriations and the amount recommended by the President in his revised budget.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I must remind the Senate that at an earlier hour today an amendment was offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] which proposed to raise the amount by \$750,000. Now the Senator from Maine proposes to raise the amount by \$500,000. I must call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the committee recommends an increase of \$250,000 over the amount allowed by the House, but \$1,089,000 below the revised estimate.

The increase recommended will permit the division to retain the most essential positions in the activity, promotion of compliance, and enforcement, but the committee directs that none of the 50 positions in the administrative category be reinstated.

The committee has made a very careful study of the entire question. I believe the committee has recommended a sum sufficient to permit the division to function adequately and properly and to carry on the functions which it must perform. I regret exceedingly that an amendment has been offered to increase this appropriation.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE].

Several Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Several Senators requested a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am advised that the appropriation allowed for the Mexican farm labor program will undoubtedly not be adequate to carry that program along as required by the act and its anticipated renewal. At the time when the budget for the Mexican farm labor program was made up, the Senate had not voted to renew the act.

Yesterday the Senate voted to renew the act for another year; and that measure will go to conference with the House of Representatives. Undoubtedly a renewal for some length of time will be made.

The total amount appropriated for the program last year was \$2,800,000, of which \$2,705,000 was actually spent. The original estimate of the Truman budget for the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1954 was \$1,760,000.

The Eisenhower budget reduced that estimate to \$1,600,000. The House voted to appropriate \$1,250,000, or a reduction of \$350,000.

I understand that the Senate committee made a careful examination of the situation, and concluded that \$1,520,000 would be required to carry the program through the next 6 months, or from July

1, 1953, to January 1, 1954. Of that amount, however, \$100,000 was allowed to liquidate the program, inasmuch as at that time the act had not been renewed or was not then in an effective process of being renewed.

If the reduction is made, the funds appropriated will be used, as I understand, as follows: \$930,000 will be used for operation of the centers through which the Mexican labor is imported, and \$314,000 will be used to carry out the terms of the international agreement and the requirements of Public Law 78. That would mean the elimination of the activities carried on within the borders of the United States.

Under the law, the Secretary is required to find whether sufficient domestic workers are available for agricultural employment, and to see that the employment of Mexican workers does not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of United States workers similarly employed, and to determine whether reasonable efforts have been made to attract United States workers at wages and hours similar to those offered to such Mexican agricultural workers.

If we eliminate the item of \$100,000 for liquidation of the program, but make an appropriation of \$1,420,000, instead of \$1,250,000, we shall be increasing the appropriation in the amount of \$170,000.

So, Mr. President, I move, as an amendment, that on page 7, in line 13, "\$1,250,000" be stricken out, and that there be substituted, in lieu thereof, "\$1,420,000."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, since the committee approved this item, a bill extending the Mexican farm labor authorization for 1 year's time has been passed. Therefore, there has been submitted to the House of Representatives a supplemental budget request to include funds for the total fiscal year. For that reason, there can be no objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont. If the amendment is approved, it will be in conference at the same time when the House is considering the supplemental bill to take care of the administration of the Mexican farm-labor program for the entire year.

Of course, at the time when the committee approved this bill, we had before us proposed legislation to authorize the continuation of the program only through December 1953. Therefore, we were proposing the appropriation of funds for the 6 months' period.

However, now that the law has been extended, there is no reason to object to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). Does the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Minnesota is accepting the amendment?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the amendment of the Senator from Vermont is intended to cover the entire year.

Mr. AIKEN. No. A supplemental appropriation will be required, anyway, because the other appropriation was for only 6 months, and the committee added



an appropriation of \$100,000 for liquidation of the program.

Mr. DWORSHAK. So the Senator from Vermont now proposes that this item be increased to \$1,400,000, for Mexican agricultural labor to be imported into the United States; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I propose that this item be increased to \$1,420,000, which will allow for appropriation of the amount which the appropriations subcommittee determined to be advisable, less the \$100,000 which was intended to be used for liquidation purposes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield further to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is the Senator from Vermont confident that that amount is needed in order to carry on this program in an orderly way?

Mr. AIKEN. I think so.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Has there been any evidence to justify that conclusion?

Mr. AIKEN. I have never taken part in this recruiting and placement program. I have to take the word of those who I think have done as well as they could under the circumstances.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As the Senator from New Hampshire knows—

Mr. TOBEY. That is all right; we shall be glad to claim him. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHAVEZ. Pardon me; I meant to say that as the Senator from Vermont knows, I opposed the original bill providing for the importation of Mexican nationals to work on farms in the United States. However, as a result of investigations which have been made in the field—in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California—I am convinced that if the crops of those States, including crops of fruits and vegetables, among which are potatoes, celery, and tomatoes, are to be harvested, it is absolutely necessary that this class of labor be available. Those crops cannot be harvested unless this class of labor is available, I am convinced. That is due to the fact that around Carlsbad, N. Mex., in California, and Ocean City—an area close to Camp Pendleton, the Marine base—such low wages are being paid for common labor that people in that area will not work on the farms. I have been informed by the farmers themselves and by those connected with the program that it will be impossible for the farmers of southern California to harvest those crops, which are worth millions and millions of dollars, without having this class of labor available.

I think the appropriation being requested is a very modest one, considering the program.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have before me some interesting statistics which I should like to present to the Senate in regard to this particular item. I am very much indebted to the Senator from Ver-

mont for bringing up the matter this afternoon.

The figures I have are based upon the reduced amounts of appropriations as proposed by the Secretary of Labor. We find that there is a total of 296 employees, according to his estimate. My tally shows 298.

The Senator from Vermont suggests that a larger appropriation be made for this purpose. I wish to ask a few simple questions about this situation, because it is typical of what happens when we begin with something simple, which ultimately blossoms into a full-blown bureaucracy.

For instance, I should like to know why 118 of the employees are in Washington, D. C., rather than in the field. Among them I find that there are, for instance, 23 labor economists. I do not know why labor economists are needed to tell us about Mexican agricultural workers to be employed in the United States. We find that included in the employees of this agency is a group of agricultural employment specialists. Each one of these officials is augmented by a full staff of clerks, typists, and so forth. We find that the employees in Washington include placement assistants, position classifiers, space analysts, and others. There is a program development and evaluation branch, and there is an agricultural employment specialist. As I have said, 118 persons are working here in Washington to administer the activities of a total of 170 persons who are spread over Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, and in many places in Mexico.

Despite the good work the Secretary of Labor attempted to do in reducing this program, I do not feel that he has gone far enough. I repeat that I hold in my hand evidence of the typical spread of bureaucracy in Washington, D. C.

I may say that these figures and this list of job classifications only bear out what the distinguished Senator from Illinois said earlier this afternoon, namely, that if we are going to practice economy, we must really do so.

This is a type of foolishness we must eliminate from the Government. Certainly we need a farm-labor program under the existing law, but I contend that we do not need all of the extra, fancy, tinsel trimmings which have been applied within the past 20 years, and which the Republican Party was put into office to eliminate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would not consider that the program resulted from an act of foolishness. I want to say that the program recommended by the Eisenhower administration represents a substantial reduction in the number of employees recommended by the Truman budget. In the Truman budget 342 employees were recommended; in the Eisenhower budget, 296. The amount allowed by the House and by the Senate committee would provide for 195 employees. That is roughly 1 employee for 1,000 Mexicans who come over the border. It seems to me that is about as few as it is possible to get along with. It would seem that difficulties will be encountered in getting

farm labor this year. It also looks as if some difficulty might be experienced by our Government in getting together with the Mexican Government and arranging for a limitation. At least, the two governments have not been able to get together thus far. However, from the overall viewpoint, I would say that having these programs would result in getting labor in a much more orderly manner than as if we had no program at all, and there would probably be fewer violations involved. The House has voted an extension for 3 years. Yesterday, the Senate voted an extension for 1 year. We do not know what the outcome of the conference may be. We do not know how long the Mexican farm-labor program may be continued. But I do know that the farm operators of the Far West and of the Southwest are desirous of having the program continued. As I say, the motion I made would provide for some inspection within the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Vermont is aware of the fact, is he not, that the \$1,250,000 provided in the bill was for a 6 months' period only?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And that \$170,000 has been added to that. Is not that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from Minnesota has just indicated, the budget estimate for the remaining 6 months amounted to \$900,000. I wonder whether the Senator would agree to modify his amendment so as to increase the amount to \$2,150,000 in order to provide sufficient funds.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know. I understand the House is already conducting hearings on the supplemental request for \$900,000 to continue the program for the last 6 months of the year.

Mr. ELLENDER. That will be included in a supplemental bill. My idea was that, since the law was extended yesterday, we might as well provide sufficient funds to carry the program for an additional year.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Before replying to the Senator from Louisiana, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota. I shall then see where we stand.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, so far as the Senate is concerned, we would, of course, have to have an authorization, and the Appropriations Committee would have to conduct hearings on the supplemental bill to carry out the program for the next 6 months. But, since the Senator has yielded, I desire to call attention—

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. An authorization is already provided in the original bill.

Mr. THYE. Then I will correct myself by saying the authorization need



not be extended, but that we shall have to conduct hearings for the purpose of determining the amount of the appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understood that the Bureau of the Budget had sent an estimate of \$900,000, which, if added to the \$1,250,000, would provide funds with which to carry on the program for the entire year.

Mr. THYE. Such a budget request has been sent to the House, and the House at the present time is conducting hearings on it.

I should like to comment upon the statement of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] by saying that the Senate Appropriations Committee, under the revised budget request, has reduced the number of positions from 342 to 296. The House allowed 195 positions. But I must call attention to the fact that at the present time there is the highest employment rate we have had in the history of this Nation. That means that we must depend upon imported labor to carry on the seasonal stoop-labor to enable the farmers to harvest their crops.

I was in Minnesota on Saturday, the 4th of July, and Sunday, July 5. At that time I noted across the countryside, even though there was a holiday, the Fourth of July, that nevertheless the farmers were harvesting the pea crop. The pea crop is canned. I also noticed that they were harvesting the field peas on Sunday. That crop must be harvested as soon as it reaches maturity, otherwise there is an absolute loss. I noted that imported farm laborers were engaged in handling the peas, both in the field and at the vinery, to which the peas are brought for the purpose of being shucked. It is necessary to use imported labor at a time when there is high national employment, as at present; otherwise it would be impossible to harvest the crops when they are ready for harvesting.

So whatever criticism may be made about bureaucracy being developed, we must, nevertheless, have the personnel necessary to administer the program; otherwise workers might be congregated at the border, and not spread across the Nation to supply the needs of the farmers for labor when the harvesting season is on, whether it be in Minnesota, Montana, in the extreme Northwest section of the country, or in the New England area. While the program may be criticized, I do not know how we are to get a proper allocation of the imported workers unless we know where they are to be used, and when they are to be needed.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say a word before yielding to the Senator from Idaho. I think the Senator from Minnesota has aptly pointed out that it would be impossible to appropriate for the last 6 months of the fiscal year until the bill which passed the Senate yesterday had been completely processed and signed by the President, thus giving an authorization. In further reply to the Senator from Arizona, I may say I cannot guar-

antee that some of the money in question will not be wasted. In the case of all our appropriations to Government agencies, I presume it would be difficult to find a single agency in which there was not some money wasted or spent inefficiently.

The amount which I am proposing is \$180,000 below the Eisenhower budget request and \$320,000 below the Truman budget request. So I think I can say, at least, that if any of it is wasted, there will not be as much wasted as there would be if they had several hundred thousand dollars more. They will have to be very economical.

It has been pointed out by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] that we may have a very tight farm-labor situation. I noticed in a report on the ticker today that something like 1½ million persons have been added to our employment numbers for the month of June, which shows that employment is still on the upgrade, and it is getting more difficult every year to get people to get down on their knees for almost any purpose whatever.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If the Senator's amendment is agreed to, and \$900,000 is added subsequently, what would the total be?

Mr. AIKEN. It would be \$2,320,000. But we must remember that the item of \$900,000 is now under hearings by the House committee. It has to pass the House committee and the House, and the Senate committee and the Senate, before it becomes available for use.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the Senator tell us what the reduction will be from the past fiscal year to the next fiscal year, under the program?

Mr. AIKEN. It is very difficult to tell exactly. The number of positions provided for in the Truman budget was 342; by the Eisenhower budget, 296; by the House recommendation, 195; by the Senate subcommittee's restoration, 270.

I am suggesting taking 100 off the subcommittee's recommendation, so I would say it would bring the number down to the neighborhood of 240, or approximately 100 fewer employees than provided for in the Truman budget.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If there is a reduction of approximately 300 in personnel, I should like to know the amount which the Senator would anticipate would be provided for the entire year, as compared with \$2,700,000. Will there not be far more funds available than would be needed to take care of the situation, with a proposed reduction of 100 employees? I should like to know whether we are merely having additional personnel to sit in some building on the banks of the Potomac River to help the farmers harvest their crops, or whether we are merely retaining a lot of holdover politicians who like their jobs and who probably have little regard for helping the farmers of the country harvest their crops.

Mr. AIKEN. A few minutes ago I made a rapid calculation in mental arithmetic for the Senator from Idaho, but he now propounds a problem which is a little too deep for me to do offhand. So long as jobs are available and money is available to pay high salaries, un-

doubtedly there will be no lack of applicants for the jobs. I am simply taking it for granted that the Eisenhower Budget Bureau made a study of the situation, including what amount was necessary, and, as I say, I am taking \$180,000 off the recommendations.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am fully aware of the record of the Senator from Vermont for economy, and I believe he wants to handle the subject in an equitable manner and not provide funds in excess of what will be required to carry on an efficient program in connection with Mexican labor.

Mr. AIKEN. That should be the aim of all of us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 24, it is proposed to strike out "\$5,725,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,025,000."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, we thoroughly discussed this amendment this morning. It deals with the proposal to cut the appropriation for tuberculosis research. The amendment is in response to various telegrams, one of which I read, asking for the restoration of \$2,515,000. I discussed the matter with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, and also with the cosponsors of the amendment, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], and we find that the grants-in-aid to States would be covered if there were an additional appropriation of \$1,300,000.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, \$1,300,000 is \$1,300,000, and that is a large sum of money, when we consider that the item proposed to carry out the purpose of section 314 of the act calls for only \$5,725,000. If we add another million dollars to that amount, we are increasing it tremendously.

It was brought out that the Interior Department receives an appropriation for a tuberculosis program among the Indians. I thought the Senator from North Dakota was proposing to raise the amount only by \$150,000 or \$125,000. I would accept a \$125,000 increase, but I certainly could not agree to consider an increase of \$1,300,000. That is just too much money, Mr. President.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.



Mr. CLEMENTS. I understand the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota would add \$1,300,000 covering grants in aid to the several States.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Would it not put the figure back to what it was a year ago?

Mr. LANGER. It would make it exactly what it was a year ago.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The figure a year ago was approximately \$5 million, the figure for the next fiscal year is \$4 million, and the Senator is asking that it go back to the figure of 1 year ago; is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I do not want to detain the Senate by reading it, but I have in my hands a statement of what each State in the Union received for fiscal 1953, and also what they would receive under the proposed allocation for fiscal 1954. It shows \$5,300,000 as the 1953 appropriation, and \$4 million for the next fiscal year. I notice that in the State of Minnesota there would be a reduction of \$21,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a letter from the National Tuberculosis Association, and include a table showing what each State will be reduced by an appropriation of \$4 million.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL TUBERCULOSIS ASSOCIATION,  
New York N. Y., July 6, 1953.

The Honorable EARLE C. CLEMENTS,  
Senate Office Building,  
United States Capitol,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CLEMENTS: I am enclosing a table showing the amounts of money allocated by the United States Public Health Service to the States for tuberculosis control work within those States as per your request.

I am enclosing also a publication of the National Tuberculosis Association entitled, "Less Money For Tuberculosis Control Means More Tuberculosis," in which we have stated the reasons of tuberculosis associations for opposing the reduction in funds for tuberculosis control.

Your consideration of this matter and assistance in the reinstating of some funds for the tuberculosis appropriation when H. R. 5246 is considered by the Senate would be most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

N. J. SWEARINGEN,  
Legislation and Veterans.

Grants to the States for tuberculosis control  
from the U. S. Public Health Service

State	Allocation, 1953	Proposed allocation, 1954
Total.....	\$5,300,000	\$4,000,000
Alabama.....	123,500	92,300
Arizona.....	56,400	46,100
Arkansas.....	86,200	65,900
California.....	283,900	227,100
Colorado.....	43,800	31,500
Connecticut.....	73,700	51,600
Delaware.....	19,500	17,500
District of Columbia.....	48,500	38,200
Florida.....	111,800	78,300
Georgia.....	160,300	112,200
Idaho.....	16,800	14,700
Illinois.....	266,500	199,100

Grants to the States for tuberculosis control  
from the U. S. Public Health Service—  
Continued

State	Allocation, 1953	Proposed allocation, 1954
Indiana.....	\$107,900	\$80,800
Iowa.....	45,700	30,300
Kansas.....	56,600	39,600
Kentucky.....	144,400	107,300
Louisiana.....	104,700	78,900
Maine.....	29,900	24,200
Maryland.....	105,100	78,100
Massachusetts.....	172,600	120,800
Michigan.....	171,400	129,200
Minnesota.....	71,700	50,200
Mississippi.....	118,000	82,600
Missouri.....	123,900	92,100
Montana.....	21,800	17,900
Nebraska.....	32,300	23,300
Nevada.....	10,600	8,500
New Hampshire.....	17,100	13,700
New Jersey.....	133,400	106,700
New Mexico.....	39,000	29,800
New York.....	423,200	338,600
North Carolina.....	153,400	107,400
North Dakota.....	36,800	25,800
Ohio.....	228,700	168,000
Oklahoma.....	88,700	62,100
Oregon.....	48,400	33,900
Pennsylvania.....	267,500	216,000
Rhode Island.....	28,800	22,300
South Carolina.....	112,600	78,800
South Dakota.....	22,200	17,900
Tennessee.....	151,900	113,200
Texas.....	190,900	155,700
Utah.....	18,000	15,300
Vermont.....	19,200	15,800
Virginia.....	151,400	108,000
Washington.....	67,300	48,000
West Virginia.....	73,700	54,200
Wisconsin.....	85,600	59,900
Wyoming.....	11,700	10,500
Territories and possessions.....	323,000	254,100

Mr. LANGER. Even if the amount be raised in accordance with the amendment, it will still be \$1,300,000 less than it was 2 years ago.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the cut proposed is approximately a 30 percent overall cut?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is an extremely serious cut, is it not?

Mr. LANGER. That is true.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that in the past 15 years we have steadily made progress in the treatment of tuberculosis, so that today we see a chance of minimizing the effect and the incidence of the disease?

Will not the proposed cut of 30 percent, or \$2,500,000, at a time when we are making progress set the program back possibly for years and thus jeopardize the lives of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of people in our country?

Mr. LANGER. I can best answer the Senator by reading a telegram I have received from the Hettinger County Tuberculosis and Health Association:

Restoration of the \$2,515,000 cut—

That has been reduced to \$1,300,000 by my amendment—

by the House from Federal tuberculosis appropriation is urgently requested. To permit this cut at this time would jeopardize whole tuberculosis control movement which has done so much toward control of this dread disease in the State of North Dakota as well as throughout the Nation.

My distinguished friend, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] joined with me this morning in the discussion. The proposed reduction would

jeopardize all the work that has been done on tuberculosis research in the last 20 years. As the Senator from New York said, wonderful progress has been done toward wiping out the disease.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no doubt that as a practical step the Senator from North Dakota has been wise to reduce the amount he is asking for in his amendment to \$1,300,000. Of course, I shall support the amendment as it now stands, but I have no hesitation in saying that even if that amount should be granted, it would be completely inadequate for the needs of the country.

We in New York, like the people in the State of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, are doing and have been doing a good job on tuberculosis control and have made great progress. The reduction proposed will place in jeopardy our entire program, in which we have made progress so laboriously.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. My understanding of the item is that last year \$8,240,000 was appropriated. The Senator's figure of \$7,025,000 is practically \$1,250,000 less than was appropriated for fiscal 1953. Is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. The figure \$7,025,000 is more than \$500,000 below the original budget estimate for this year. Is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. Was not that figure used because it represents the amount necessary to meet the matching commitments of the States?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. And also because State legislatures already have met and have made appropriations to meet the figure which would be allocated on the basis of \$7,025,000?

Mr. LANGER. The Senator has stated the facts correctly.

Mr. CASE. But if it is made, the reduction will fall on the overhead, or something of that sort?

Mr. LANGER. My amendment would still provide \$1,200,000 less than the sum provided a year ago.

Mr. CASE. But enough to match the amounts the States are putting up?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from North Dakota view his amendment as a means of fulfilling commitments which have already been made on the part of States and localities under this program?

Mr. LANGER. I do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, does the Senator believe that in order to continue the kind of program which has been carried on to date, and which apparently is authorized by respective localities and States, the sum he is recommending is needed?

Mr. LANGER. I do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What is the Senator's understanding of the amount presently recommended in the bill?



Mr. LANGER. It is entirely inadequate and will result in disaster, if the program is to be carried out, especially in the Northwest. As a matter of fact, it will be disastrous throughout the country, wherever tuberculosis is being battled. Wonderful progress has been made. We shall be cutting \$1,200,000 from the amount appropriated a year ago, even by adopting the amendment.

It seems to me that a reduction of \$1,200,000 from \$8 million is a very substantial cut.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I correct in understanding the Senator to say that even with the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota we shall still be short \$1,200,000, as compared to the sum appropriated for the last fiscal year?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What would be the total shortage as compared with the amount appropriated for the last fiscal year?

Mr. LANGER. One million two hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What would be the difference under the committee proposal?

Mr. LANGER. The committee took off \$2,515,000.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In the 1953 appropriation, for the control of tuberculosis, \$8,240,000 was provided. The original budget estimate as submitted by the Truman administration called for \$7,645,000. The revised budget estimate calls for \$5,725,000. The Senator will note that there was a substantial reduction proposed by President Truman in the 1954 budget. His original budget request made a substantial reduction from what was contained in the budget for fiscal 1953. However, the revised budget estimate reduced that sum to \$5,725,000. I simply call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Truman administration saw the need for a reduction.

It must be recognized that mobile units were really introduced for investigational and research activities with a view to tuberculosis control. Mobile units moved into Pittsburgh, New York, Portland, Ore., and other large cities of the Nation, and conducted so-called X-ray demonstrations and made X-ray findings in cases of tubercular afflicted persons.

The time has arrived when the educational aspect of the program has been carried out. Great numbers of people throughout the Nation have been made acquainted with the need to have chest X-rays.

My criticism has been that larger cities, instead of smaller cities, have had the benefit of mobile units. Smaller cities could not afford to operate or to own mobile units. The program was often financed in the larger cities with funds in excess of what the Federal Government provided to conduct so-called scientific research into this particular health activity.

So I believe that if the whole question were reviewed, it would be seen that even the Truman administration saw the need for a reduction from the amount appropriated in 1953.

The committee has studied the revised budget recommendation. If the Senate should increase the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget on this item, I do not know why we would need to stop at even a million dollars. There need be no limit, if we do not wish to pay any attention to the Budget Bureau or any attention to what the House has done. I do not know where we would go. We might just as well go on and make ourselves merry.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield, so that I may ask a question of the senior Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Would the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota bring up the appropriation for grants-in-aid to the amount that was appropriated a year ago?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. CLEMENTS. A year ago the amount was \$5,300,000, and the Senator's amendment would bring the amount up to exactly the figure of a year ago for grants-in-aid?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. The amount appropriated in grants to States for tuberculosis control activities in the 1953 appropriation was \$5,300,000. The original 1954 estimate was \$5,300,000. The revised estimate was \$4 million. But for the overall amount, this sum would be added to it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Would not the overall appropriation for last year be greater than the amount for this year, even with this amendment?

Mr. THYE. The overall appropriation last year was \$8,222,000. Last year the program called for 421 positions. President Truman saw fit, in the 1954 budget recommendation, to reduce the number of positions from 421 to 375.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me simplify this question—

Mr. THYE. He also proposed a budget recommendation of \$7,645,000, as against a 1953 appropriation of \$8,222,000.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not correct that if the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota were adopted, the appropriation for next year would still be \$1 million under what was expended a year ago for this purpose?

Mr. THYE. That is true; but the Truman budget recommendation reduced it before the Eisenhower budget recommendation came forward.

Mr. CLEMENTS. But it was not reduced below the figure which is being proposed by the Senator from North Dakota at this time.

Mr. THYE. That is true. However, the new administration reviewed the entire question and made a recommendation in which the House concurred. The Senate Appropriations Committee also concurs in it. Therefore, I cannot accept the amendment proposing to increase this appropriation by \$1,300,000.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I merely wish to make a brief explanation to my distinguished friend, the Senator from North Dakota. This morning when he told me that he proposed to offer this amendment, I expressed a sympathetic interest in it. I think he might have been justified in feeling that I would support it. Let me say to my good friend that after most careful consideration this afternoon I have concluded not to support it. I felt that I owed that explanation to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, the situation is simply this: Mr. Truman recommended \$600,000 less than was spent a year ago. The Eisenhower administration came along and took \$900,000 more from the estimate. All we are doing is asking to restore enough so that we can match what the legislatures of a great many States have already appropriated. The amount involved is \$1,300,000, which would still leave a total of \$1,200,000 less for tuberculosis control than was spent a year ago. The proposal is as simple as that.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. I inquire of the able Senator from North Dakota if it is not a fact that, in view of the rapid increase in population, the necessity for the appropriation for which he is asking, which would provide simply the amount appropriated a year ago, is much greater than it was 12 months ago?

Mr. LANGER. That is true; but we would not even get the amount appropriated a year ago. We would still be \$1,200,000 short, even with my amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senate might be interested in noting, on page 744 of the hearings, how the respective States would be affected. Take, for example, the State of West Virginia. In 1953, last year, the State of West Virginia received \$73,700. Under the committee proposal, it would receive \$54,200. It would lose about \$19,500.

Mr. LANGER. And the Senator's own State of Minnesota would lose more than \$18,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Minnesota had \$71,700 in 1953. Under the present proposal it would have \$50,200, which would be a difference of some \$21,500 as compared with last year. A similar situation applies to other States.

Mr. President, the very first city in the United States to have the tuberculosis-control program was the city of Minneapolis. I was fortunate enough to be president of the Board of Public Welfare at the time the program was inaugurated. We were the pilot or pioneer city. It is a great program, which has produced amazing results. The incidence of detection of disease is simply phenomenal.

I agree with what the chairman of the subcommittee says as to the importance of this program progressing into the smaller communities. But let us not



forget for a minute that there is still from 30 to 40 percent of the urban population which has not been X-rayed or tested. So there is no need of curtailing the program in the cities. It is merely a question of expanding it in the smaller communities.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. In my opinion, if the reduction suggested in this appropriation for the State of West Virginia were submitted to the voters of that State, there is not one man or woman, Republican or Democrat, within the boundaries of West Virginia, outside an insane asylum, who would not unhesitatingly say, "We want this appropriation." They would eagerly approve the appropriation which is being asked for by the Senator from North Dakota. We need more money instead of less, for tuberculosis control in West Virginia. I sincerely hope the Senator's amendment will prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. I ask for a division.

Mr. THYE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of no quorum has been made. The clerk will call the roll. Does the Senator from Minnesota wish to withdraw his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. THYE. I simply wished to make clear—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to withdraw his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. THYE. Let the quorum call proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hendrickson	Millikin
Anderson	Hennings	Monroney
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Morse
Beall	Hill	Mundt
Bennett	Hoey	Murray
Bricker	Holland	Neely
Bush	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd	Jackson	Payne
Capehart	Jenner	Potter
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cooper	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smathers
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Ellender	Lehman	Symington
Ferguson	Long	Thye
Flanders	Magnuson	Watkins
Goldwater	Malone	Welker
Gore	Mansfield	Wiley
Green	Martin	Williams
Griswold	Maybank	Young
Hayden	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, none of us would object to granting aid to the

States in connection with their efforts to reduce the number of tuberculosis patients. But I must call attention to the fact that on the Senate floor this afternoon we have raised the appropriations in the bill \$5 million over the revised budget recommendation. In the event we increase this appropriation by \$1,300,000, we will add that much more to the deficit. For that reason I must recommend that we stay within the Budget Bureau's recommendation. Therefore, I must oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, even though it is in the health field.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had not intended this afternoon to say much, if anything at all, on the health items in the bill, because I thought the bill would go through the Senate after some minor amendments were adopted on which we have had a great deal of testimony. Ever since I have been in Congress I have been particularly interested in, and have sponsored legislative-wise, many of the health items. As a matter of fact, I was one of the cosponsors of the National Cancer Institute when I was a Member of the House. I do not want some statements made today to go unchallenged.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who is the chairman of the subcommittee, stated that if we adopt the pending amendment of the Senator from North Dakota affecting tuberculosis research we will have increased the bill by some \$5 million.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will yield at that point, I said that we have already voted to appropriate \$5 million more than the Budget Bureau's recommendation. We have at the present time voted \$18,205,000 more than the committee recommended.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I meant to say that there would be an increase of \$5 million over the revised budget estimates.

Mr. THYE. We have voted, without including the pending amendment, \$18,205,000 over what the Committee on Appropriations recommended. If we add \$1,300,000—and I know there are at least one or two more amendments to be offered which would increase the amount by another million dollars—we will exceed the recommendations of the Budget Bureau by that much more. I thought I should call that fact to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not criticize the Senator for doing so. I merely wish to make my observations. I have heard a great many impassioned speeches today about economy in government. I believe all of us are in favor of economy in government. The disagreement comes with our definition of economy. Assuming the amount for the health needs of the country is \$25 million or \$50 million. Some people have made impassioned pleas. Yet they are the very ones who never raised a voice when a few weeks ago, by an action of the administration, the interest rates on Government bonds were raised in which action will cost the taxpayers \$2,500,000,000. I believe when we start to talk about economy we ought to start to pick

and choose where we will economize. That one action has cost the taxpayers of the United States almost \$3 billion. I am informed by members of the Committee on Banking and Currency that it has cost \$300 million to refinance the one issue. Maybe that is all right. But I cannot become greatly moved by impassioned speeches of those who would allow that sort of thing to go on without at the same time raising a voice at least once in a plea for the health needs of the American people, even if the cost should be \$25 million. That is less than the cost of one light cruiser. We will save many more lives, perhaps a thousand fold or more, by an investment in the health field, even though a light cruiser may be needed.

Some one said to my distinguished friend the Senator from Illinois, "We have spent \$114 million for cancer research, and I want to see some results."

Since 1944, even if we have spent a billion dollars, if some results have been obtained, the expenditure will have been worth while. It is false economy not to go ahead with the health programs. I do not know what the exact figure should be.

I know that the Senator from Minnesota must defend the work of his committee. However, the plea for economy, "Where are we going to economize?" and the plea, "Why don't we economize on items like these?" In my opinion represent false economy when other extensive programs are carried on. All the money we have appropriated for health in the past 7 years, will not add up to what one action in the past weeks has cost the taxpayers, which is 10 or 20 fold the cost we are talking about.

When we talk about economy, we ought to keep the record straight. All of us are in favor of economy. Of course, we have cut down on the needs of Alaska, where all the Indians suffer from tuberculosis.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the pending bill does not provide for the Indians in Alaska.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know; they are covered in a later portion of the bill. It is on the next page, I believe.

Mr. THYE. The Indians are covered in the Interior Department appropriation bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be glad to yield the floor a little later.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I am not opposed in any way at all to the farm program. We have what we call a farm support program. Does not the Senator believe that it would be advisable to have a health support program also, so we will keep the consumers healthy to eat the products of the farms?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Certainly. Someone is always making the odious comparison that we spend 60 times more for bug or insect research than we do for health research. I am for both types of research. Every time we consider a little



amount of money for the health needs of the nation we always meet with the same opposition: "When are we going to economize? Here is where we can economize."

I suggest to some of those who have made impassioned pleas today that they talk to the Treasury Department about saving some money. There seems to be no difficulty in appropriating billions of dollars in favor of the financial interests of the country; but when we seek to have a very modest appropriation made for cancer research, for instance, there is strong opposition. I do not know how far the work in cancer research has progressed. Most of the work which has been done thus far by the scientists has been done without charge to the Federal Government.

Certainly this program is a sound investment. I agree that the appropriation requested may be somewhat in excess of the revised budget estimate, but this item is one for which the appropriation which is made should be in excess of the revised budget estimate.

Mr. President, I have made these brief observations because of the statements which have been made about the necessity for our beginning to economize, in view of the fact that the attempt to economize is made in regard to this item. Some of us are convinced that not nearly enough has been appropriated for this program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator from Washington recall any protest which was made regarding the appropriation of \$350 million or \$400 million to prevent the spread of the hoof and mouth disease into the United States?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think there was any protest about that appropriation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am afraid Congress thinks more about the admirals and generals than it does about the welfare of the Nation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the appropriation requested for the cancer research program is certainly little enough, when we realize that 1 out of every 8 persons within the sound of my voice either has cancer or will have it.

Some say to us that before the appropriation is made, some results of the work done thus far should be shown. Shame on those who oppose the making of an appropriation to combat such a deadly disease. Shame on those who are willing to have Congress make large, liberal appropriations for Wall Street interests, but are not willing to have Congress make even a modest appropriation for the purpose of this vital program. Whenever we propose an appropriation for this program, some Members of Congress favor the making of cuts in the item.

Mr. President, I repeat that in view of the tremendous appropriations which are made for the Defense Establishment, certainly Congress should not hesitate to make this appropriation, which will enable real progress to be made in the endeavor to prevent thousands and

thousands of American citizens from suffering from this dread disease.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] on page 18, in line 24.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is absent on official committee business. If present and voting the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware, [Mr. FREAR] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] would vote "nay."

The yeas-and-nays resulted—yeas 39, nays 38, as follows:

#### YEAS—39

Aiken	Jackson	Maybank
Anderson	Johnson, Tex.	McClellan
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Monroney
Chavez	Kefauver	Morse
Clements	Kennedy	Murray
Douglas	Kerr	Neely
Duff	Kilgore	Pastore
Gore	Langer	Russell
Green	Lehman	Smathers
Hayden	Long	Sparkman
Hennings	Magnuson	Tennis
Hill	Malone	Symington
Humphrey	Mansfield	Young

#### NAYS—38

Barrett	Flanders	Payne
Beall	Goldwater	Potter
Bennett	Griswold	Purtell
Bricker	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Bush	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Holland	Smith, N. J.
Cooper	Jenner	Thye
Cordon	Knowland	Watkins
Dirksen	Kuchel	Welker
Dworshak	Martin	Wiley
Ellender	Millikin	Williams
Ferguson	Mundt	

#### NOT VOTING—18

Bridges	Frear	Johnson, Colo.
Butler, Nebr.	Fulbright	McCarran
Byrd	George	McCarthy
Carlson	Gillette	Robertson
Daniel	Hunt	Taft
Eastland	Ives	Tobey

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recorded as voting in the negative.

On this question the yeas are 39, the nays 38. So the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, lines 9 and 10, it is proposed to strike out "\$32,500,000" and insert "\$33,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I desire to ask the Senator whether he will accept an amendment to his amendment, to add another \$500,000, which would make possible the opening of a hospital in Detroit, as well as the one in Memphis. The amendment would then increase the amount by \$1 million, which is about \$50,000 less than the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that both the United States Public Health Service hospital located at Memphis and the hospital located at Detroit serve similar purposes, the one in Detroit serving largely the Great Lakes area and the one in Tennessee serving the inland waterways area, both hospitals being now filled with United States Employment Compensation Commission patients, I accept the amendment, since they are both within the budget estimate, and each would serve a similar purpose. I accept the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the amendment, as modified, would propose to substitute \$33,500,000.

Mr. THYE rose.



Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I was informed of the amendment, and, as chairman of the subcommittee, I am willing to take it to conference. It was discussed in committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there are a few correcting amendments I should like to call to the attention of the Senate.

The Committee on Appropriations recommended an initial sum of \$41,000 for the construction of buildings at the Columbia Institute for the Deaf. Instead of \$41,000, through an error in the printing of the bill, there appears on page 11, in line 22 the sum "\$41,100." The Senate Committee on Appropriations, in its report No. 478, at page 6, comments on the recommendation and states the figure as being "\$41,000," as also appears by reference to the table on page 27 of the report. I move that, on page 11, line 22, "\$41,100" be stricken out, and that "\$41,000" be inserted in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. THYE. There is another correcting amendment, on page 32, line 5, with reference to the working capital fund, to strike out the word "control," and insert "central." This correction is in accordance with the language to be found on page 22 of the report above referred to, under the heading, "Working Capital Fund."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, inasmuch as amendments were adopted this afternoon which increased the amount of funds for the Rehabilitation Service, I believe that the bill should be amended so as to increase the amount of money for the rehabilitation service to the District of Columbia, since we have increased the overall amount; therefore, the amount of \$175,000, which appears in the bill, on page 16, in line 21, should be increased to \$195,000. I ask that the bill be amended accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THYE. Yes, indeed. I am most happy to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, 1 of the 10 regional wage and hour offices is located at Nashville, and serves a very important area, which includes portions of several States. There has been a great deal of concern, both on the part of manufacturers and also on the part of workers within that area, relative to the possibility of closing the Nashville regional wage and hour office. The lan-

guage found on page 5 of report No. 478 of the Committee on Appropriations is to the effect that the reductions will be applied so that none of the 10 present regional offices will be closed. At any rate, that is the intention. Is that the understanding of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. THYE. I will say to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, that we raised this question with the Secretary and were positively assured that the 10 regional offices would be continued. Therefore, I can assure the Senator that the committee has concerned itself with the question. The Senate bill provides \$6,250,000, and the House bill provides \$6,000,000.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wanted to make that clear, and I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator in reference to page 3, line 25, of the bill. I have in my possession a letter from the Secretary of Labor in reply to a communication from me in which I inquired as to the budget problems of State employment security agencies as affected by the pending appropriation bill. I informed the Secretary that I had received a number of inquiries and protests. The Secretary said, in part, in his letter, that if the cuts made by the Senate committee are not restored, it will be necessary to bring about some retrenchment in the activities of the Bureau of Apprenticeship.

I should like to ask the Senator whether the \$3,230,000, which is below the President's budget estimate, was discussed with the Secretary of Labor and whether the Senator feels that with that sum, in view of the fact that I have this communication from the Secretary of Labor, it will be possible to continue the regional programs?

Mr. THYE. So far as the regional programs are concerned, I cannot see how they will be affected.

The committee took into consideration, when it reduced the amount, the fact that there was a reduction in the workload. I read from page 3 of the committee report:

A review of the workload summary reveals that in comparison with fiscal year 1948, the workload for fiscal year 1952 had decreased 8.08 percent in programs; 3.79 percent in establishments participating; and 23.30 percent in apprentices; while the appropriations had increased 48.77 percent and employees had increased 25.51 percent. And in consequence the committee feels that this slight reduction of 5 percent under the House allowance, and 2.82 percent under the revised estimate, is justified.

It was really the workload reduction which brought about the reduction in the appropriation. We did not foresee that there was any need of the elimination of any of the so-called programming.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have read the committee's report, and I assumed that was the reason for the cut.

In the section of the bill which pertains to unemployment compensation,

under the title of "Bureau of Employment Security," I notice on page 5 the figure of \$197,100,000. This is a substantial increase, being \$800,000 above the House figure. I have in my possession, and I am sure the Senator has seen it, a letter which came to my office today from the Commissioner of the Department of Employment Security in the State of Minnesota, stating that he is somewhat concerned over the limitation of funds. He also encloses a report of the State of Wisconsin Industrial Commission. The commissioner in that State is likewise very much concerned. I should like to ask the Senator for an explanation of the reduction, so that we may have it in the RECORD.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will look at line 2, on page 5, it will be noted that there was a contingent fund provided in the amount of \$10 million. In other words, the funds to that extent were impounded unless there were certain changes in the anticipated workload. An amendment was offered proposing to reduce the contingent fund from \$10 million to \$5 million, so \$5 million will be made available for an administrative fund, which would increase the \$197,110,000 by \$5 million.

I think that should allay the fears expressed in the letter to the junior Senator from Minnesota. I received a similar letter which I discussed with the Labor Department, and I think we have met the need by transferring from the impounded fund \$5 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Eisenhower budget figure was \$213,600,000. That is a substantially larger sum than appropriated. I was somewhat disturbed that we might find ourselves in a serious situation. I suppose that situation could be met by a supplemental or deficiency appropriation at a later time.

Mr. THYE. It could be. That was the reason why the contingent fund was set up.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD the letters to which the senior Senator from Minnesota and I have referred.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,  
DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,  
St. Paul, Minn., July 6, 1953.  
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
United States Senate,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The Wisconsin agency has prepared a very concise and clear-cut statement on the budget problem of State employment security agencies as affected by the pending appropriation measure, H. R. 5246. It points up the problem so well that I am sending it on to you for your information.

You note the postscript says that substantial layoffs are now occurring in Wisconsin. In Minnesota, the employment is still at a relatively high level, however, all but 1,300 of the 29,000 increase in manufacturing jobs between 1950 and 1953 was in the defense related metalworking industries. A worsening of the agricultural situation plus reductions in defense employment would, without question, substantially increase unemployment in the State.



I would like to add this one point to the Wisconsin letter. If Congress appropriated \$207.1 million that would leave for the fiscal 1953 workloads \$197.1 million (\$207.1 million less \$10 million) which would be exactly the same as was required for fiscal 1953. That, however, would really be a cut because of higher prices generally, and that is why the Eisenhower budget provided a cushion of about \$6 million.

We would appreciate any assistance you can give us on the matter.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR CHRISTGAU,  
Commissioner.

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,  
INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION,  
July 2, 1953.

Subject: Grants to States, H. R. 5246, page 5, line 2.

If you were responsible for the American economy this new fiscal year, as you are, would you throw away the only "horseshoe nail" we now have to help handle unemployment?

Is it safe or wise for you, or the Senate, or the Congress to gamble on less unemployment in 1953-54?

When unemployment occurs, on what programs must our economy and our jobless workers rely, for stopgap benefits and for finding new jobs?

On the State unemployment compensation and employment service programs, clearly.

Is this a good time for Congress to cripple these key State programs, by slashing their operating money for fiscal 1954 not only below the Eisenhower budget but even below the fiscal 1953 level?

These vital State programs depend on the amounts provided by H. R. 5246, at page 5, line 2, for "Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration."

The House figure for such grants was \$26 million below the Eisenhower budget.

The Senate Appropriations Committee figure, \$197,110,000 is still 16½ million below the Eisenhower budget figure of \$213,600,000.

Don't be misled by the \$197,110,000 figure shown in H. R. 5246, at page 5, line 2. It may look the same as the fiscal 1953 actual appropriations figure; but it isn't the same in fact. Here's why. The \$197,110,000 total includes two parts:

(1) The \$10 million "contingency" portion, which will not be available—under House report language—to handle in fiscal 1954 the basic workload volume experienced in fiscal 1953.

(2) The basic appropriation of \$187,110,000 (left after subtracting the \$10 million "contingency" portion from the \$197,110,000 total figure).

That basic remainder—\$187.1 million, for fiscal 1954—is the figure to compare with the \$197.1 million total available in fiscal 1953. Why? Because it's supposed to handle the same basic workload volume.

To permit decent State administration, the Eisenhower budget figure of \$213,600,000 should be restored on the Senate floor—in place of the inadequate \$197,110,000 total now carried by H. R. 5246.

We strongly urge you to help restore the missing \$16½ million for grants to the States.

Those \$16½ million are mighty good—and cheap—insurance against unemployment.

Adequate grants to the States will help them to preserve decent back-home government.

Neither you nor jobless workers nor employers would like the unavoidable results of inadequate grants to the States—delayed benefit payments, fewer and tardier placements, less policing of benefit claims, etc.

We understand that Senate floor action on H. R. 5246 will probably occur on Tuesday, July 7.

We hope you'll be in there pitching.

Sincerely,

VOYTA WRABETZ,  
Chairman, Industrial Commission  
of Wisconsin.

P. S.—Substantial layoffs are now occurring in Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD statements which I have withheld in order to expedite the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENTS BY SENATOR MURRAY

The action taken by the Appropriations Committee in failing to restore to the appropriation for the Department of Labor the full amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget is, in my opinion, unwise. Any alleged saving which would result from the reduction of operating funds for the Department would be made at the expense of the working men and women of this country who look to the Department of Labor as the single governmental agency charged with the responsibility of fostering and encouraging the growth and progress of the labor movement. These valuable services of the Department of Labor should be expanded rather than reduced.

It is a recognized fact that the industrial growth and prosperity of the Nation depend in no small measure upon the maintenance of continued full employment and high wage levels. The Department of Labor performs a most important function in the maintenance of the high standards which characterize our American free enterprise system. It performs valuable services not only to the workers but to the employers through such programs as apprenticeship training, which provides an adequate supply of highly skilled and competent craftsmen for the various fields of industrial activity.

The Department of Labor has also rendered real service to the farmers of America through the administration of the Mexican farm labor program, providing for the recruitment of farm labor. Another function of the Department which is of primary importance to the industrial life of America is that of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This important agency is the oldest bureau in the Department of Labor and one of the oldest in the Federal Government. It has functioned continuously for nearly 70 years. Throughout this period the Bureau has developed into a service organization of primary importance to the industrial life of the United States and today produces more current statistics bearing upon general economic conditions than any other agency of the Federal Government. It covers the broad fields of manpower and employment, price statistics, wage and industrial relations statistics, construction statistics, productivity statistics, statistics of industrial injuries and several other smaller programs. Any reduction in funds for this Bureau would seriously cripple these vital and necessary functions.

Another important agency of the Department of Labor is the Wage and Hour Division, whose responsibility is to administer the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Act. Mr. President, we should keep in mind that the proper administration of these acts is important not only to wage earners, through the establishment and

maintenance of minimum wage levels, overtime pay provisions and other minimum fair labor standards, but also to protect employers engaged in interstate commerce from the unfair competition of other unscrupulous employers who sometimes seek to perpetuate conditions which the Congress, in the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Act, has deemed to be unjust, unfair, and uneconomic.

The result of the failure of Congress to appropriate sufficient funds for the operations of the Department of Labor will be to cripple its vital functions so that the sole agency of Government dedicated to the progress and welfare of America's working men and women would be reduced to the status of a second-class department. This policy, in my opinion, is extremely shortsighted and unsound because services vital to the growth and prosperity of American labor will be eliminated, and this in turn will inevitably result in lowered living standards and depressed wages for the workers. While at the present time we have been able to maintain high levels of employment and wages, nevertheless it is quite clear that this is due in large part to our defense effort and the spending of Government funds for procurement of war materiel. If, Mr. President, as all of us hope, there should be a lasting peace, then, inevitably, defense spending will taper off. In the resulting readjustment period there will undoubtedly be considerable unemployment. For that reason alone, to cripple the vital functions of the Department of Labor by failing to appropriate adequate funds at this time is an unsound and unrealistic policy based, I presume, upon some false notion of economy.

For these reasons I sincerely urge the Senate to restore the full amount of funds recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for the operation of the Department of Labor for the coming fiscal year.

I am glad that the Senate committee agreed with the House that no reductions should be made in so important a program as vocational education. In my own State of Montana its value is apparent to everyone. There is no question but that every expenditure we have made to date for vocational education has paid prompt and real dividends not only to Montana but to the Nation as well. Our vocational education people are doing an excellent job. I sincerely hope that as the future makes it possible to divert our attention and our energies from costly crisis in foreign lands, we will devote a good part of them to expanding our programs of vocational education and to seeing to it that the fine men and women working in that field receive much more adequate recompense than is the case today. It is long overdue them.

#### STATEMENT RE APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

If there is one thing that is crystal clear in connection with this appropriation bill, it is that in this one instance at least the national interest, the interests of both Republican and Democratic Parties, and the self-interest of each and every one of us here on the floor of the Senate, should be as one in recommending that we appropriate at least as much money for the National Institutes of Health as has been approved by our committee.

As one of the sponsors of the legislation which created these great centers of research into the causes and cure of those devastating diseases now under study through the Institutes of Health, I, myself believe we could well afford to appropriate the entire \$125 million which competent and expert witnesses testified could well be used for this research during the forthcoming year. Just so long as one trained investi-



gator is willing to devote his science, his skill, and his life to the attempt to solve the mysteries of cancer, heart disease, mental health, arthritis, neurology, or blindness but is prevented from doing so for lack of funds, I will maintain that we are either being negligent in our duty to the Nation and its people or are, at the very least, guilty of attaching greater importance to ways of taking life than to ways of saving life. I believe that with the billions upon billions we are appropriating for divers causes, we could well afford to appropriate one and a quarter million for these hope-inspiring, life-giving projects.

I know I need not talk at length of the inestimable values which can accrue from this sort of research. I need not take your time to explain at length how it happens that a dollar devoted to medical research is not a dollar spent but is rather a dollar invested in an enterprise guaranteed to return rich dividends. These are facts recognized as such on both sides of the aisle. But I should like to briefly review some of the evidence that has accumulated over the past several decades which highlight these values.

Let us look at the record. Over the 12-year period from 1937 to 1949, medical research gave the average American the gift of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  more years of life expectancy. In that short span of time, the life expectancy of the average American rose from 60 years to almost 68 years. Many Members of this distinguished body are here today, giving of the wisdom of their mature years to our deliberations, only because medical research has developed drugs to fight off premature death.

Most of us here can remember just several decades back to the time when such diseases as diphtheria, yellow fever, typhoid, and scarlet fever struck terror into every home. There are many of us here who lost loved ones—a mother, a father, a sister, or a brother—to one or another of these killers.

Today, death from diphtheria or typhoid or scarlet fever is a rarity in this country. Why? Has this been produced by an act of magic? On the contrary. It has been the direct result of the devotion of a small band of medical researchers, who with comparatively limited funds at their disposal, fought through to victory against death. Many of these gallant researchers gave up their own lives in the fight.

I remember the days not so long ago when the very word "pneumonia" brought a chill to the spine, when many a household was saddened by the loss of a beloved child to the ravages of this disease.

Today, we hear little talk of pneumonia. In the 7 years from 1944 through 1951, the death rate from pneumonia declined 46 percent, due largely to the discovery of sulfa drugs and penicillin.

Look at some of the other miracles due to the same medical research which produced sulfa and the antibiotics, including penicillin. In just 6 years, following World War II, the appendicitis death rate has decreased more than 50 percent and the maternal death rate 57 percent. Tuberculosis, which used to smash the body and frequently consign it to a living death, is gradually being conquered—in these past 6 years, the tuberculosis death rate has dropped 50 percent, largely due to streptomycin and case finding.

The United States Public Health Service has been in the forefront of this battle against disease. A few years back, a number of Public Health Service officers gave up their lives in the fight against Rocky Mountain spotted fever. Through its own direct research program out at Bethesda, Md., and more importantly, through grant programs to medical researchers in medical schools, hospitals, universities, and small laboratories in every 1 of the 48 States, the Public Health Service has been instrumental in writing the world's most brilliant chapter in the advance of medical research and in the saving of lives.

The Congress certainly need not apologize for the appropriations it has made to date to and through the Public Health Service to carry on this work. Not even the most vociferous advocate of economy need be afraid to stand up and proclaim that for this medical research he violated an otherwise established rule. The people of America—in every part of America—are solidly in favor of these efforts to combat disease. I, myself, as I have said, believe we should and could appropriate twice as much for this purpose as the committee has recommended. Yet, I know that the members of our Committee on Appropriations are just as much interested in this program as am I. I know too that they have had to weigh its needs and their desires against the exigencies forced upon us and our economy by those who would enslave the world and force political thought control even on men of science engaged in objective medical research. And, so I wish to congratulate the members of our committee on the position they have taken. Most certainly we must not allow these funds to be reduced one penny below the amounts they have approved.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I should like to point out that members of the Appropriations Committee, and, particularly, of the subcommittee, which handled this appropriation bill, are not necessarily lacking in sympathy for many of the programs, merely because they are unwilling to increase various items beyond the revised budget requests. At a time when we are trying to bring about greater economy, it is certainly unreasonable to contend that because we deny all the funds requested by some of the advocates and supporters of agriculture, we are against the farmer. If we apply the same principle to the Interior Department or the Veterans' Administration, we should not be accused of being against programs in these departments. Every activity is expected to assume its share of economy.

During the debate insinuations were made that we were trying to resort to ill-conceived economy. One Senator made the charge, I am sure inadvertently, that a certain witness appearing before the subcommittee had been browbeaten and abused by the chairman or some other member of the committee.

I wish to point out that the hearings on this bill comprised about 1,550 pages. As a member of the subcommittee, I desire to pay a tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. I attended most of the hearings, and I state unequivocally that no one could have been more courteous, more sympathetic, or more tolerant than was the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

I have made these brief remarks because I think it was entirely uncalled for and unfair for anyone to have made such charges against the chairman of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. THYE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. HILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL LOANS—PERMISSION TO SUBMIT REPORT DURING RECESS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report the drought disaster relief bill after hours tonight. I think we can get the report ready in time to be printed, so that we shall have it tomorrow; but I doubt that we shall be ready to report it before the Senate recesses tonight unless the Senate continues in session longer than it apparently intends.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LOAN OF TWO SUBMARINES TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ITALY AND ONE SMALL AIRCRAFT CARRIER TO THE GOVERNMENT OF FRANCE

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 496, Senate bill 2277.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2277) to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Italy and a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2277) to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Italy and a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe an explanation was made when the bill was called on the calendar yesterday. The Senator from Nevada may recall that during the 2d session of the 82d Congress authority was given to lend to the Government of The Netherlands, for a period of not more than 5 years, two submarines to be used in training naval personnel of that nation in antisubmarine tactics. Senate bill 2277 authorizes the loan of two submarines to Italy for the purpose of training Italians in submarine warfare.

It also authorizes the loan of one small aircraft carrier to France, for use in Indochina for a period of 5 years, unless the war in Indochina ends before that time.

From the point of view of the United States, the bill is more favorable than was the bill providing for the loan of submarines to the Netherlands, for the







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 14, 1953  
For actions of July 13, 1953  
83rd-1st, No. 129

## CONTENTS

Agricultural adjustment.....12	Flood control.....21	Research.....14
Appropriations.....8,10	Foreign aid.....3,13	Rubber.....23
Cotton.....9	Legislation.....25	Small business.....10
Drought relief.....1,19	Mutual security.....25	Soil conservation.....15,27
Electrification.....24	Nomination.....4	T.V.A.....24
Expenditures.....26	Potatoes.....5	Trade, foreign.....9
Factory inspection.....25	Price discrimination.....11	Treaties.....7,20,25
F.C.A.....4	Prices, support.....6,18	Wheat.....2
Farm policy.....18	Reorganization.....16	Wool.....9
Flag.....17		

**HIGHLIGHTS:** Both Houses completed congressional action on drought-relief and foreign-aid bills. Senate ratified Wheat Agreement and passed measure to carry it out. Senate and House conferees were appointed on wheat marketing quota bill. Senate received Arnold nomination to FCA. House passed customs-simplification bill. House Rules Committee cleared supplemental appropriation bill. House committee reported bill to modify trade agreements law. Rep. Steed spoke in favor of livestock price supports.

## SENATE

- 1. DROUGHT RELIEF.** Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 6054, the drought-relief bill (pp. 8835-7, 8886-7). This bill will now be sent to the President.
- 2. WHEAT.** Ratified Executive H, to revise and extend the International Wheat Agreement. The Agreement and an explanation of it are printed in the Record. (pp. 8890-912.)  
Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 97, to provide for effectuation of the new International Wheat Agreement (pp. 8873, 8912).  
Senate and House conferees were appointed on H. R. 5451, to amend the wheat marketing quota law (pp. 8834, 8887).
- 3. FOREIGN AID.** Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 5710, to amend and extend the Mutual Security Act. The House vote was 221-109. (pp. 8938-40, 8861-8.) This bill will now be sent to the President. Sen. Wiley expressed regret that the authorization for ICEF was not larger (p. 8883).  
Sen. Morse inserted a paper by E. J. Bell favoring "Aid By Trade" (pp. 8883-6).
- 4. NOMINATION** of Carl Raymond Arnold to be FCA Governor was received (p. 8948).
- 5. POTATOES.** S. 2124, relating to repacking of potatoes, was taken from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and referred to the Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 8880).



6. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Langer inserted a Carson (N. Dak.) Commercial Club resolution favoring present price-support legislation (p. 8874).
7. TREATIES. Sen. Wiley criticized the Bricker resolution, to limit treaty powers, and inserted letters opposing it (pp. 8880-3).

#### HOUSE

8. APPROPRIATIONS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 6200, the supplemental appropriation bill, 1954 (p. 8872).  
House conferees were appointed on H. R. 4974, the State, Justice, Commerce and Appropriation bill for 1954 (p. 8882), and H. R. 5246, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1954 (p. 8834). Senate conferees have been appointed.
9. FOREIGN TRADE. Passed, with amendment H. R. 5377, to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 to simplify customs procedure (pp. 8837-61). Rejected a committee amendment to require that injury or threat of injury be proved by an industry before a countervailing duty would be imposed by the Treasury Department (pp. 8860-1). Rep. Scott said this amendment was opposed by wool and cotton groups, etc. (p. 8843).  
The Ways and Means Committee reported without amendment H. R. 5894, to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act to provide additional protection for American workers, farmers, etc. (H. Rept. 777)(p. 8872).
10. SMALL BUSINESS. Adopted H. J. Res. 294, making appropriations for the Small Defense Plants Administration for July 1953 (p. 8831).
11. PRICE DISCRIMINATION. Rep. Patman claimed there is a nationwide effort to fool the independent merchant as to his right to buy cooperatively under the Robinson-Patman Act (pp. 8868-9).

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

12. AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT. H. R. 6257, by Rep. Hunter, and H. R. 6259, by Rep. Rhodes of Ariz., "to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938"; to Agriculture Committee (p. 8872).
13. FOREIGN AID. H. R. 6262, by Rep. Radwan, to authorize CCC commodities to be used for foreign aid; to Agriculture Committee (p. 8872).
14. RESEARCH. S. 2367, by Sen. Aiken, "to strengthen the conduct of research" in USDA; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 8876).
15. SOIL CONSERVATION. S. 2368, by Sen. Aiken, to amend Sec. 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 8876).

#### BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

16. REORGANIZATION. S. 106, to establish a Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch. Approved July 10 (Public Law 108).  
S. 1514, to establish a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Approved July 10, 1953 (Public Law 109).
17. FLAG. S. 694, to prohibit display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the U. S. flag except under specified circumstances. Approved July 9, 1953 (Public Law 107).



# DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BUSBEY, JENSEN, BUDGE, TABER, FERNANDEZ, ROONEY, and CANNON.

## WHEAT MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5451) to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOPE, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, HILL, POAGE, and GRANT.

## CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 81 on Thursday last I am recorded as being absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

## SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 330, Rept. No. 771), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6200) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any provisions contained in said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration

of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## TAX ON ADMISSIONS TO A MOVING-PICTURE THEATER

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 331, Rept. No. 772), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 157) to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now in the bill, but such amendment shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, with such amendment if adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, and the amendment thereto if adopted, to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

## INVESTIGATION OF EDUCATIONAL AND PHILANTHROPIC FOUNDATIONS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 217, Rept. No. 773), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That there is hereby created a special committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of educational and philanthropic foundations and other comparable organizations which are exempt from Federal income taxation to determine if any foundations and organizations are using their resources for purposes other than the purposes for which they were established, and especially to determine which such foundations and organizations are using their resources for un-American and subversive activities; for political purposes; propaganda, or attempts to influence legislation.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) on or before January 3, 1955, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any duly author-

ized subcommittee thereof, if authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places and within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold hearings, administer oaths, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Upon the passage of this resolution, the Sergeant at Arms of the House is authorized and directed to ascertain the location of all books, papers, files, correspondence, and documents assembled by the former select committee under House Resolution 501, 82d Congress, and take same into his custody, depositing such records with the Clerk under rule XXXVII. The Clerk of the House is hereby authorized to loan such records and files to the special committee established by this resolution for the official use of the special committee during the 83d Congress or until January 3, 1955, when they will be returned in accordance with said rule.

## SECOND RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 5894, the Second Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## DR. GEORGE W. GILLIE

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to call to the attention of the Members of the House a high honor which will soon be bestowed upon a former colleague and my Republican predecessor from the Fourth District of Indiana, Dr. George W. Gillie, of Fort Wayne.

On July 20, Dr. Gillie, who served in the House of Representatives from 1938 through 1948, will receive the highest award which can be presented by the American Veterinary Medical Association at its 90th annual convention at Toronto, Canada.

Each year, the AMVA recognizes a veterinarian for meritorious service to the membership of the organization. This year Dr. Gillie will receive the award. He will be presented with both a certificate and the AMVA medal.

While serving in the House, Dr. Gillie was a member of the House Agriculture Committee. He was a leader in the fight to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease during the terrible epidemic in Mexico, which also threatened the cattle industry of the United States. He also sought to establish a Government-sponsored laboratory to study ways and means of preventing the recurrence of this dread disease.



could result in rescinding present countervailing duty on Uruguayan wool tops.

ARTHUR O. WELLMAN.

BOSTON, MASS., July 10, 1953.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
Ways and Means Committee,  
House Office Building:

We strongly urge you endeavor persuade Ways and Means Committee eliminate amendment from customs simplification bill (H. R. 5877) relating to requirement injury test before countervailing duties can be imposed. Our industry had no opportunity express our opposition this clause which was not in original bill. Respectfully request your opposition to such fundamental change in statutory law without opportunity for industries vitally affected to be heard.

KENNETH MARRINER,  
Marriner & Co., Inc.

GRANITEVILLE, MASS., July 10, 1953.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
House Office Building:

We understand that simplification bill, H. R. 5877, will be offered on House floor this coming Monday, July 13, to require injury test before countervailing duties could be imposed. We urge that this matter be given a full hearing, as it might result in rescinding present countervailing duty on Uruguayan wool top.

EDWARD M. ABBOTT.

BOSTON, MASS., July 9, 1953.

Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:

Am advised Ways and Means Committee will offer amendment to customs simplification bill which would add so-called injury test to countervailing duty statute. This is a new feature of bill on which no public hearings were held. We strongly oppose as this would nullify countervailing duties recently imposed on imported wool top. Please do your utmost to defeat amendment.

RUFUS F. HALE,  
Assistant Treasurer, Pacific Mills,  
140 Federal Street, Boston, Mass.

BOSTON, MASS., July 10, 1953.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
House Office Building:

We understand Ways and Means Committee will propose on House floor to amend customs simplification bill to weaken present countervailing duty statute by adding an injury test to it. This amendment is highly controversial. It was not a part of the bill as introduced and was considered by the committee only in executive session. It might require rescinding of present countervailing duty against subsidized wool top imports from Uruguay and would be grossly detrimental to United States wool industry. Please attempt to persuade Ways and Means Committee not to offer amendment at this time but to embody it in separate bill and hold hearings on that bill.

ERNEST BENTLEY,  
President, Boston Wool Trade  
Association.

WEST CHELMSFORD, MASS., July 10, 1953.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
House Office Building:

We are advised that an amendment will be proposed to H. R. 5877, customs simplification bill, on Monday when it comes to the floor of the House under a rule permitting honoring this amendment. It will seriously affect our business in your district. Please vote against this amendment and the whole bill as there are other features of the bill that will materially curtail our operations in the plants in your districts.

H. E. FLETCHER CO.

NORTH CHELMSFORD, MASS., July 10, 1953.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
New House Office Building:

Reference H. R. 5877, in regard to customs simplification bill, we are unalterably opposed to any amendment requiring injury to be proven before countervailing duty can be imposed.

SOUTHWELL COMBING CO.

LOWELL, MASS., July 13, 1953.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
House Office Building:

We are advised that an amendment will be proposed to H. R. 5877, customs simplification bill, today when it comes to the floor of the House under a rule permitting only this amendment. It will seriously affect our business in your district. Please vote against the amendment and the whole bill as there are other features of the bill that will materially curtail our operations in the textile mills in your district.

MERRIMACK MANUFACTURING CO.

LOWELL, MASS., July 10, 1953.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
New House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Referring to H. R. 5877, in regard to customs simplification bill, we are unalterably opposed to any amendment requiring injury to be proven before countervailing duty can be imposed.

GILET CARBONIZING CO.

NOBILERICA, MASS., July 10, 1953.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
New House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Referring to H. R. 5877, in regard to customs simplification bill, we are unalterably opposed to any amendment requiring injury to be proven before countervailing duty can be imposed.

NORTH BILLERICA CO.,  
J. A. MORRILL.

BOSTON, MASS., July 10, 1953.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:

We believe amendment to customs simplification bill, H. R. 5877, relating to requirement injury test before countervailing duties can be imposed would have adverse effect on our industry. Hope you will do all possible to persuade House Ways and Means Committee to eliminate this amendment.

DRAPER TOP CO.

BOSTON, MASS., July 10, 1953.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

We strongly oppose the injury test amendment to H. R. 5877, customs simplification bill. This amendment could mean the rescinding of the recently imposed countervailing duty on wool top imports from Uruguay, which are openly subsidized. These subsidized wool top imports have been, and certainly would be again, greatly detrimental to the entire wool and topmaking industry. Injury test proceedings are always time consuming and great damage can result during the time necessary to fulfill an injury test requirement. We strongly question the motive behind such an amendment and strongly urge you to do all in your power to separate this amendment from this bill and, if necessary, have its proponents embody it in a separate bill on which all interested parties could be heard.

WALKER TOP ASSOCIATES.

BOSTON, MASS., July 10, 1953.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

It is vital to us as part of the wool industry that amendment to customs simplification bill, H. R. 5877, requiring injury test before countervailing duties can be imposed, be defeated, and we respectfully urge you to use all of your influence against this amendment.

THURMOND & Co.

ANDOVER, MASS., July 13, 1953.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
House Office Building:

We understand customs simplification bill, H. R. 5877, is being reported to floor of House today. My associates and I strongly oppose its passage. Our company is one of the smaller rubber manufacturers employing about 900 people. In the depressed labor area of Lawrence, Mass. Our principal products are rubber and canvas rubber-soled footwear which are particularly vulnerable to foreign competition. We are convinced that passage of proposed bill would help increase such competition at a time when our industry, which is essential to our country's defense, is particularly vulnerable. We urge that proposed legislation be at least postponed until general tariff study scheduled for ensuing year can be completed.

TYER RUBBER,  
W. E. BRIMER, President.

NEW ENGLAND MANUFACTURING  
CONFECTIONERS ASSOCIATION,

Boston, Mass., July 10, 1953.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I understand that the customs simplification bill, H. R. 5877, probably will be voted on in the House next week, possibly on Monday.

The candy industry in New England is worried about Congressman EBERHARTER's proposed amendment to impose an injury test so that countervailing duty would not be imposed to compensate for any bounty being paid by foreign governments to their manufacturers to export unless our own domestic industry could prove injury. The duty on candy might be increased in several instances because we have definite proof that the bounties are being paid.

This particular amendment would prevent our getting any relief. Incidentally, there has been a tremendous increase in imported candy.

The candy manufacturers in New England will appreciate your good efforts in seeing that this particular proposed amendment to H. R. 5877 is defeated.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER R. GUILD,  
Managing Director.

(Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### FILING OF MINORITY REPORT

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a minority report on the bill H. R. 356.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.







31. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the second conference report on H. R. 4663, the 1st independent offices appropriation bill, 1954 (H. Rept. 997)(pp. 10220-2).  
 Received the conference report on H. R. 5246, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1954 (H. Rept. 995)(pp. 10222-5).  
 Received the conference report on H. R. 5471, the D. C. appropriation bill for 1954 (H. Rept. 996)(pp. 10225-6).
32. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Rep. Patman claimed the Federal Reserve Board has "launched a propaganda drive for permanent controls over installment credit which are nothing more than trade controls" (pp. 10218-20).  
 Rep. Deane discussed the Government's fiscal policy and the impact of recent interest-rate increases on the economy (pp. 10211-17).
33. RUBBER. Received the conference report on H. R. 5728, to dispose of Government rubber-producing plants (H. Rept. 999)(pp. 10182-7).
34. REORGANIZATION. Rep. Brown of Ohio, Rep. Holifield, Joseph P. Kennedy, and Sidney A. Mitchell were appointed to the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (p. 10125).
35. CREDIT UNIONS. Passed without amendment S. 873, to amend the D. C. Credit Unions Act to bring it into line with the Federal Credit Unions Act (p. 10160). This bill will now be sent to the President.
36. SMALL BUSINESS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 514, to create a Small Business Administration (pp. 10172-82).
37. FOUNDATIONS INVESTIGATION. Agreed to, with amendment, H. Res. 217, to create a select committee to investigate foundations (pp. 10188-203).

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

38. PROPERTY. H. R. 6534, by Rep. Bender, to provide for Federal payments in lieu of taxes on property; to Interior and Insular Affairs (p. 10229).  
 H. J. Res. 310, by Rep. Mason, relating to prohibitions upon giving or lending of Government property to any foreign government or international organization; to Judiciary Committee (p. 10230).
39. REORGANIZATION. H. R. 6535, by Rep. Dodd, to amend the Reorganization Act of 1939 so as to authorize either House to disapprove specific provisions in reorganization plans; to Government Operations Committee (p. 10229).
40. PERSONNEL. H. R. 6537, by Rep. Forand, and H. R. 6539, by Rep. Mason, to amend the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 10229).
41. CLAIMS. H. R. 6541, by Rep. Miller, Calif., to extend the time for filing claims on behalf of certain claimants; to Judiciary Committee (p. 10229).
42. MINERALS. H. R. 6543, by Rep. Pfof, to create a Department of Mineral Resources; to Government Operations Committee (p. 10229).
43. POSTAL RATES. H. R. 6544, by Rep. Reams, to establish a postal rate-making procedure under the executive department; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (pp. 10229-30).
44. WOOL. H. R. 6548, by Rep. Hagen, Calif., to amend the Tariff Act to encourage



amendment S. Con. Res. 40, requesting that "United States of America" be placed on exported American-made goods (H. Rept. 967)(p. 10228).

21. PUBLIC LANDS; RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 4646, providing for the exchange of public lands for private sustained-yield timber lands which are acquired in connection with Federal projects (H. Rept. 972); S. 837, permitting exchange and amendment of farm units on Federal irrigation projects (H. Rept. 977); H. R. 2839, enabling the Hawaiian Homes Commission to exchange certain lands for public lands (H. Rept. 979); and H. R. 5731, authorizing the De Luz Dam, Calif. (H. Rept. 984)(p. 10228).
22. BUDGETING; PROPERTY. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendment H. R. 2, to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed revenues except under certain conditions (H. Rept. 981); and without amendment H. R. 6382, to extend until June 30, 1954, the period during which GSA may conduct negotiated sales of surplus property (H. Rept. 982)(p. 10228).
23. IMMIGRATION. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendment H. R. 6481, to authorize entry of refugees, etc., into this country (H. Rept. 974), and the Rules Committee reported a resolution for its consideration (p. 10228).
24. TAXATION; PAYROLLING. The Ways and Means Committee reported with amendment H. R. 6413, to permit the Federal Government to withhold from employees' wages certain municipal taxes (H. Rept. 992)(p. 10229).
25. WATER COMPACT. Passed without amendment S. 1197, consenting to a water compact between Nebr., Wyo., and S. Dak. (p. 10140). This bill will now be sent to the President.
26. ELECTRIFICATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 3598, to consolidate the Parker and Davis Dam projects (p. 10133).
27. MINERALS. Passed with amendment S. 2220, to amend the mineral leasing laws regarding pipelines passing through the public domain (pp. 10132, 10143-4).  
Passed with amendment S. 1397, relating to mining claims located on land with respect to which a permit or lease has been issued, or an application of offer for permit or lease has been made, under the mineral leasing laws, etc., after Rep. Gavin first objected and spoke about his concern for protection of the surface values on national forest land (pp. 10133, 10141).
28. LAND TRANSFERS. Passed as reported H. R. 1797, to convey certain land to Eastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College (pp. 10133-5).  
Passed as reported H. R. 2458, to authorize transfer of a tract of national forest land at Cherry Point, N. C., to the Navy (p. 10137).  
Passed without amendment H. R. 3097, to authorize transfer of a grape-research station to the U. of Calif. (pp. 10137-8).  
Passed without amendment H. R. 5883, to authorize transfer of a cotton field station to N. C. (p. 10138).  
Passed as reported H. R. 107, to provide for transfer of the site of the original Ft. Buford, N. Dak., to N. Dak. (p. 10140).
29. ORCHARD LOANS. Passed without amendment H. R. 4158, to extend for 5 years the USDA authority to make certain loans to orchardists in the Pacific Northwest (pp. 10140-1, 10144).
30. PERSONNEL. Passed as reported H. R. 6185, to amend the Veterans' Preference Act with respect to disabled veterans (p. 10142).

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION,  
AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

---

JULY 27, 1953.—Ordered to be printed

---

Mr. BUSBEY, from the committee of conference, submitted the  
following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 5246]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 13, 21, 45, 50, 56, and 60.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 8, 12, 14, 15, 16, 22, 27, 29, 31, 32, 41, 42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 55, 63, and 64, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,350,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,475,000; and the Senate agree to the same.



Amendment numbered 5:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$700,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$5,300,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$192,205,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$6,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$5,200,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,800,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$6,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,162,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$65,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$875,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$33,100,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$20,237,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$12,095,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$15,168,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$4,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,525,000; and the Senate agree to the same.



Amendment numbered 51:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,150,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$171,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$22,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$365,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: *December 31, 1953*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$75,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$9,125,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 26, 28, 37, 59, and 61.

FRED E. BUSBEY,  
BEN F. JENSEN,  
HAMER H. BUDGE,  
JOHN TABER,  
A. M. FERNANDEZ,  
JOHN J. ROONEY,  
CLARENCE CANNON,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

EDWARD J. THYE,  
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,  
STYLES BRIDGES,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,  
DENNIS CHAVEZ,  
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
LISTER HILL,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*



## STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

#### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 1—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$1,350,000 instead of \$1,250,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,448,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Amendment No. 2—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$1,475,000 instead of \$1,350,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—*Salaries and expenses*: Reported in disagreement.

#### BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

Amendment No. 4—*Salaries and expenses*: Reported in disagreement. In connection with amendment No. 4, and other similar language authorizing the Department of Labor to pay expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences, the managers desire that the Department make a full report on each instance that such authority is used during the first 6 months of fiscal year 1954, setting forth the cost to the Federal Government and the justification therefor, and submit copies of such report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees not later than January 15, 1954.

Amendment No. 5—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$700,000 instead of \$624,000 as proposed by the House and \$800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

Amendment No. 6—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$3,230,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,400,000 as proposed by the House.

#### BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$5,300,000 instead of \$5,100,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,435,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which \$1,100,000 is for carry-

ing out the provisions of title IV (except sec. 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$981,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10—*Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration*: Appropriate \$192,-205,000 instead of \$187,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$197,110,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which \$6,000,000 shall be available as a contingency fund instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11—*Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration*: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to authorize the use of contingency funds for State salary increases.

Amendment No. 12—*Unemployment compensation for veterans*: Appropriates \$38,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$41,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13—*Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program*: Appropriates \$1,250,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,420,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Amendment No. 14—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$5,345,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,250,000 as proposed by the House.

#### WOMEN'S BUREAU

Amendment No. 15—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$350,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$360,000 as proposed by the House.

#### WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Amendment No. 16—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$6,250,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the House. In connection with amendment No. 16 the managers desire that none of the Wage and Hour Division's regional offices be closed as a result of the reduction in the amount requested to be appropriated for fiscal year 1954.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18—Reported in disagreement.

### TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

#### COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

Amendment No. 19—*Construction of buildings*: Reported in disagreement.

#### FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 20—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$5,200,000 instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.



## HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Amendment No. 21—*Construction of buildings*: Appropriates \$20,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$170,000 as proposed by the Senate. In connection with amendment No. 21 the managers desire that the Department include, in its budget for 1955 or in its next supplemental budget request, a proposal for such rewiring and incidental alterations as may be necessary to enable Howard University to use commercial electric power.

## OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Amendment No. 22—*Promotion and further development of vocational education*: Provides that not more than \$450,000 shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$2,800,000 instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,926,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24—*Salaries and expenses*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25—*Payments to school districts*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 26—*School construction*: Reported in disagreement.

## OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Amendment No. 27—*Payment to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico)*: Provides that not to exceed \$195,000 shall be available for providing rehabilitation services to disabled residents of the District of Columbia as proposed by the Senate instead of \$175,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28—*Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico)*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 29—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$655,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$690,000 as proposed by the House.

## PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Amendment No 30—*Tuberculosis*: Appropriates \$6,000,000 instead of \$5,725,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,025,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31—*Assistance to States, general*: Provides that not more than \$2,400,000 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32—*Communicable diseases*: Provides that not less than \$400,000 shall be used for studies, prevention, and control activities on poliomyelitis as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33—*Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene*: Appropriates \$3,162,500 instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,325,000 as proposed by the Senate. In connection with amendment No. 33 the managers desire that no reduction be made below the 1953 level of activities in connection with inspection of milk shipped in interstate commerce.

Amendment No. 34—*Grants for hospital construction*: Appropriates \$65,000,000 instead of \$50,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. In connection with amendment No. 34 the managers reaffirm the statements contained in the House and Senate reports in criticism of the "split project" method of financing by which funds are allocated to start a project with the promise that additional Federal funds will be allocated in future years to finish the project if appropriations are sufficient, thus generating pressure on Congress to appropriate large sums year after year indefinitely.

Amendment No. 35—*Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services*: Appropriates \$875,000 instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36—*Hospitals and medical care*: Appropriates \$33,100,000 instead of \$32,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$33,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37—*National Institutes of Health, operating expenses*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 38—*National Cancer Institute*: Appropriates \$20,237,000 instead of \$17,887,000 as proposed by the House and \$20,487,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39—*Mental health activities*: Appropriates \$12,095,000 instead of \$10,895,000 as proposed by the House and \$12,345,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40—*National Heart Institute*: Appropriates \$15,168,000 instead of \$12,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,418,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41—*Dental health activities*: Appropriates \$1,740,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,650,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 42—*Arthritis and metabolic disease activities*: Appropriates \$7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 43—*Microbiology activities*: Appropriates \$5,738,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,479,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44—*Neurology and blindness activities*: Appropriates \$4,500,000 instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45—*Service and supply fund*: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to reappropriate unobligated balances of 1953 appropriations for the further capitalization of this fund and restores language proposed by the House to provide for the transfer of other 1954 appropriations for this purpose.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 46 and 47—*Construction, Bureau of Old-age and Survivors Insurance*: Provide funds to prepare for construction of an office building for the Bureau of Old-age and Survivors Insurance as proposed by the Senate rather than providing funds for beginning construction of such a project and authorizing its total cost at not to exceed \$27,000,000 as proposed by the House.



Amendment No. 48—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance*: Appropriates \$1,550,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49—*Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau*: Appropriates \$1,525,000 instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50—*Grants to States for maternal and child welfare*: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to revise the method of allotting funds to States.

#### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 51—*Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary*: Appropriates \$1,150,000 instead of \$1,075,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,226,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52—*Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary*: Authorizes the transfer of \$171,000 from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund instead of \$168,000 as proposed by the House and \$175,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53—*Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel*: Authorizes the transfer of \$22,500 from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection services" instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the House and \$25,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54—*Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel*: Authorizes the transfer of \$365,000 from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund instead of \$355,000 as proposed by the House and \$375,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55—*Surplus property disposal*: Appropriates \$255,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$450,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56—*Working capital fund*: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to provide authority to the Secretary for financing additional central services under this fund.

#### REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

Amendment No. 57—Provides that the unexpended balance of the amount appropriated for school construction surveys under section 101 of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, be rescinded as of December 31, 1953, rather than on the date of approval of this act as proposed by the House and June 30, 1954, as proposed by the Senate.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 58—Authorizes the expenditure of not to exceed \$75,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the House and \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 60: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to authorize the Secretary to transfer not to exceed 2½ percent between appropriations.

Amendment No. 61: Reported in disagreement.

## TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Amendment No. 62—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$9,125,000 instead of \$9,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$9,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

## TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

## NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

Amendment No. 63—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that not less than \$181,000 shall be available for compensation of referees appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the House.

## TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Amendment No. 64—*Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust funds)*: Provides authority to purchase one passenger motor vehicle, for replacement only as proposed by the Senate.

FRED E. BUSBEY,  
BEN F. JENSEN,  
HAMER H. BUDGE,  
JOHN TABER,  
A. M. FERNANDEZ,  
JOHN J. ROONEY,  
CLARENCE CANNON,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*







ment insert "\$127,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$13,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$108,175"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$525,625"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$27,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amending the sum named therein as follows: "\$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,322,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$157,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,975,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN PHILLIPS,  
CHARLES R. JONAS,  
OTTO KRUEGER,  
JOHN TABER,  
ALBERT THOMAS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
STYLES BRIDGES,  
HOMER FERGUSON,  
GUY CORDON,  
BURNET MAYBANK,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
LISTER HILL,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4663) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

##### *Emergency fund for the President*

Amendment No. 1—National Defense: Appropriates \$300,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES

##### *American Battle Monuments Commission*

Amendment No. 2—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes the use of \$12,000 for expenses of travel as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, and 5—Construction of memorials and cemeteries: Authorize the use of \$41,276 for expenses of travel as proposed by the Senate instead of \$27,520 as proposed by the House; and appropriate \$8,500,000 for such construction instead of \$9,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,500,000 plus \$4,000,000 in the form of foreign currencies or credits as proposed by the Senate.

##### *Civil Service Commission*

Amendments Nos. 6 and 7—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$17,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$16,064,323 as proposed by the House; and authorize the use of \$476,670 for expenses of travel instead of \$383,335 as proposed by the House and \$570,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### *Federal Communications Commission*

Amendment No. 8—Land and structures: Authorizes the use of \$13,000 for such purpose as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 10, 11, and 12—Salaries and expenses: Authorize the use of \$88,000 for expenses of travel instead of \$73,335 as proposed by the House and \$90,000 as proposed by the Senate; appropriate \$7,400,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$7,100,000 as proposed by the House; and restore the provision of the House, making specific amounts available for application processing in connection with television licenses and licenses for safety and special services amended to provide that not less than \$1,018,496 shall be available for TV application processing.

##### *Federal Power Commission*

Amendment No. 13—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes the use of \$210,000 for expenses of travel instead of \$173,335 as proposed by the House and \$240,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### *Federal Trade Commission*

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$4,053,800 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,178,800 as proposed by the House; and authorize the use of \$163,035 for expenses of travel as proposed by the House instead of \$196,435 as proposed by the Senate. The conference committee was urged to authorize the use of funds appropriated to the Commission for employment of a firm of management consultants to make a survey of the Commission. Under the rules of conference the conferees were unable to comply with this request. However, it is believed the project is desirable, and it is suggested that the Commission call upon the Bureau of the Budget for assistance in this connection, a substantial sum having been recently provided this agency for improvement of management in the executive branch.

#### *General Services Administration*

Amendment No. 16—Operating expenses: Authorizes the use of \$184,750 for expenses of travel, Public Buildings Service, instead of \$161,200, as proposed by the House and \$208,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18—Emergency operating expenses: Appropriate \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$22,668,250 as proposed by the House; and authorize the use of \$24,300 for expenses of travel instead of \$22,865 as proposed by the House and \$30,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20—Repair, improvement, and equipment, outside the District of Columbia: Appropriate \$14,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$18,000,000 as proposed by the House; and authorize the use of \$146,700 for expenses of travel instead of \$133,400 as proposed by the House and \$160,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21—Remodeling of Congress Street Post Office, Chicago, Ill.: Authorize the use of \$800 for expenses of travel as proposed by the House instead of \$1,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 22 and 23—Federal Supply Service: Authorize the use of \$80,430 for expenses of travel, operating expenses, instead of \$79,865 as proposed by the House and \$81,000 as proposed by the Senate; and \$157,450 for expenses of travel under the heading "Expenses, general supply fund," instead of \$140,700 as proposed by the House and \$174,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 24, 25, and 26—National Archives and Records Service: Appropriate \$5,625,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$5,525,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide \$200,000 for nitrate film conversion as proposed by the House instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of \$30,750 for expenses of travel instead of \$24,600 as proposed by the House and \$36,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28—Administrative operations: Appropriate \$4,200,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,140,750 as proposed by the House; and authorize \$93,400 for expenses of travel instead of \$88,600 as proposed by the House and \$98,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29—Strategic and critical materials: Authorizes the use of \$176,275 for expenses of travel instead of \$143,000 as proposed by the House and \$209,550 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30—Purchase of typewriters: Strikes out the proposal of the House to include State governments as an exception within the provisions of the limitation.

#### *Housing and Home Finance Agency*

##### *Office of the Administrator*

Amendments Nos. 31 and 32—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$3,215,550 instead of \$2,587,100 as proposed by the House and



\$3,455,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of \$193,550 for expenses of travel instead of \$175,800 as proposed by the House and \$211,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 34, 35, and 36—Miscellaneous provisions: Strike out provisions in the House bill proposing a reorganization survey; assigning certain reorganization powers to the Administrator; and fixing a limit on expenditures in connection with loans to educational institutions; as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37—Defense Community Facilities and Services: Reappropriates not to exceed \$112,500, for administrative expenses, as proposed by the House instead of \$115,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 38, 39, and 40—Capital grants for slum clearance and urban redevelopment: Restore the provision of the House bill requiring the Administrator to give consideration to the efforts of the locality to enforce local codes and regulations; restore the provision of the House requiring that the authority under title I of the National Housing Act shall be used to the utmost in connection with slum-rehabilitation needs; and strike out the proposal of the House excluding expenditures by the community for parks, playgrounds, public buildings, or similar facilities as being counted as a part of the one-third contribution required of such community.

#### Public Housing Administration

Amendment No. 41—Administrative expenses: Appropriates \$6,950,000 instead of \$4,948,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42—Rejection of project by a community: The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate in connection with such amendment.

Amendment No. 43—Authorization of additional dwelling units: The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate and agrees to the same. These provisions permit the building of 20,000 units during the 1954 fiscal year. They require the Administrator to make a study of the program and submit his recommendation before February 1, 1954. The conferees realize that one Congress cannot bind any other Congress on this or any other housing program.

#### Indian Claims Commission

Amendments Nos. 44 and 45—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$117,020 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$111,020 as proposed by the House; and authorize the use of \$3,560 for expenses of travel instead of \$2,845 as proposed by the House and \$4,270 as proposed by the Senate. The increase in funds provided this agency is allowed with a view to expediting the work of the Commission and bringing its duties to a conclusion at an early date.

#### Interstate Commerce Commission

Amendments Nos. 47 and 48—General expenses: Appropriate \$9,600,000, instead of \$9,665,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$9,466,176 as proposed by the House, including funds to implement the report of the Wolf Management Engineering Company, which is strongly recommended by the conferees. The conferees have authorized the use of \$251,650 for expenses of travel instead of \$212,645 as proposed by the House and \$290,650 as proposed by the Senate.

#### National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics

Amendments Nos. 49 and 50—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$51,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$52,988,050 as proposed by the House; and authorize the use of \$310,000 for expenses of travel instead

of \$216,700 as proposed by the House and \$325,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### National Capital Planning Commission

Amendments Nos. 51 and 52—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$125,000 instead of \$97,915 as proposed by the House and \$155,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of \$5,630 for expenses of travel instead of \$4,260 as proposed by the House and \$7,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### National Science Foundation

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$8,000,000 instead of \$5,724,400 as proposed by the House and \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of \$89,500 for expenses of travel instead of \$78,000 as proposed by the House and \$101,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Renegotiation Board

Amendment No. 56—Expenses of travel: Authorizes the use of \$272,150 for expenses of travel instead of \$238,700 as proposed by the House and \$305,600 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Securities and Exchange Commission

Amendments Nos. 57 and 58—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,245,080 as proposed by the House; and authorize the use of \$127,000 for expenses of travel instead of \$104,170 as proposed by the House and \$150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Smithsonian Institution

Amendments Nos. 59 and 60—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,897,500 as proposed by the House; and authorize the use of \$10,225 for expenses of travel as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,825 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 61—Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art: Authorizes the use of \$1,800 for expenses of travel as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,600 as proposed by the House.

#### Subversive Activities Control Board

Amendments Nos. 62 and 63—Salaries and expenses: Authorize the use of \$12,500 for expenses of travel instead of \$10,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,000 as proposed by the Senate; and the use of \$100 for purchase of newspapers and periodicals as proposed by the House instead of \$500 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Tariff Commission

Amendment No. 64—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes the use of \$13,500 for expenses of travel instead of \$11,335 as proposed by the House and \$14,500 as proposed by the Senate.

#### The Tax Court of the United States

Amendment No. 65—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes the use of \$45,000 for expenses of travel as proposed by the Senate instead of \$40,000 as proposed by the House.

#### War Claims Commission

Amendments Nos. 66 and 67—Administrative expenses: Appropriate \$850,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the House; and authorize the use of \$6,260 for expenses of travel instead of \$5,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,520 as proposed by the Senate. In providing the increased amount proposed by the Senate the conferees recommended that the additional sum be used to assist in the early completion of the work of the Commission.

#### TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

#### Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendments Nos. 68 and 69—Federal National Mortgage Association: Authorize the use of \$3,250,000 of available funds for administrative expenses instead of \$2,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,200,000 as pro-

posed by the Senate; and authorize the use of \$108,175 for expenses of travel instead of \$95,750 as proposed by the House and \$120,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 70 and 71—Housing loan programs: Authorize the use of \$525,625, from available funds for administrative expenses, instead of \$411,250 as proposed by the House and \$640,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of \$27,000 for expenses of travel instead of \$26,330 as proposed by the House and \$27,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 72—Home Loan Bank Board: Authorizes the use of \$25,000 for expenses of travel instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the House and the elimination of such limitation as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73—Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: Authorizes the use of \$5,450 for expenses of travel instead of \$4,370 as proposed by the House and \$6,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 74, 75, 76, 77, and 78—Federal Housing Administration: Authorize the use of \$5,322,800 for administrative expenses instead of \$5,045,590 as proposed by the House and \$5,600,000 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of \$157,750 for expenses of travel instead of \$131,000 as proposed by the House and \$184,500 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of \$500 for the purchase of periodicals and newspapers as proposed by the House instead of \$1,500 as proposed by the Senate; provide \$26,500,000 for nonadministrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$27,500,000 as proposed by the House; and restore the provision of the House repealing the authorization for the position of Assistant Commissioner established pursuant to section 213 (f) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

Amendments Nos. 79, 80, and 81—Public Housing Administration: Authorize the use of \$10,975,000 of available funds for administrative expenses instead of \$8,973,000 as proposed by the House and \$13,025,000 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of \$800,000 for expenses of travel instead of \$685,300 as proposed by the House and \$916,000 as proposed by the Senate; and restore the proposal of the House requiring the Commissioner to make every effort to refund local bonds held by PHA.

JOHN PHILLIPS,  
CHARLES R. JONAS,  
OTTO KRUEGER,  
JOHN TABER,  
ALBERT THOMAS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

## DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1954—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BUSBEY submitted the following conference report and statement:

### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 995)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 13, 21, 45, 50, 56 and 60;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 8, 12, 14, 15, 16, 22, 27, 29, 31, 32, 41,



42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 55, 63, and 64, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$192,205,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,162,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$65,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$33,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$20,237,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,095,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$15,168,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$171,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$22,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$365,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "December 31, 1953"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$9,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 26, 28, 37, 59, and 61.

FRED E. BUSHEY,  
BEN F. JENSEN,  
HAMER H. BUDGE,  
JOHN TABER,  
A. M. FERNANDEZ,  
JOHN J. ROONEY,  
CLARENCE CANNON,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

EDWARD J. THYE,  
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,  
STYLES BRIDGES,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,  
DENNIS CHAVEZ,  
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
LISTER HILL,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

#### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### *Office of the Secretary*

Amendment No. 1—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$1,350,000 instead of \$1,250,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,448,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### *Office of the Solicitor*

Amendment No. 2—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$1,475,000 instead of \$1,350,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement.

##### *Bureau of Labor Standards*

Amendment No. 4—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement. In connection with amendment No. 4 and other similar language authorizing the Department of Labor to pay expenses of attendance of co-operating officials and consultants at conferences, the managers desire that the Department make a full report on each instance that such authority is used during the first 6 months of fiscal year 1954, setting forth the cost to the Federal Government and the justification therefor, and submit copies of such report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees not later than January 15, 1954.

Amendment No. 5—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$700,000 instead of \$624,000 as proposed by the House and \$800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### *Bureau of Apprenticeship*

Amendment No. 6—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$3,230,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,400,000 as proposed by the House.

##### *Bureau of Employment Security*

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$5,300,000 instead of \$5,100,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,435,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which \$1,100,000 is for carrying out the provisions of Title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$981,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10—Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: Appropriates \$192,205,000 instead of \$187,300,000



as proposed by the House, and \$197,110,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which \$6,000,000 shall be available as a contingency fund instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11—Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to authorize the use of contingency funds for State salary increases.

Amendment No. 12—Unemployment compensation for veterans: Appropriates \$38,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$41,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13—Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program: Appropriates \$1,250,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,420,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### *Bureau of Labor Statistics*

Amendment No. 14—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$5,345,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,250,000 as proposed by the House.

#### *Women's Bureau*

Amendment No. 15—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$350,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$360,000 as proposed by the House.

#### *Wage and Hour Division*

Amendment No. 16—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$6,250,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the House. In connection with amendment No. 16 the managers desire that none of the Wage and Hour Division's regional offices be closed as a result of the reduction in the amount requested to be appropriated for fiscal year 1954.

#### *General Provisions*

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18—Reported in disagreement.

#### **TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE**

##### *Columbia Institution for the Deaf*

Amendment No. 19—Construction of buildings: Reported in disagreement.

##### *Food and Drug Administration*

Amendment No. 20—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$5,200,000 instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### *Howard University*

Amendment No. 21—Construction of buildings: Appropriates \$20,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$170,000 as proposed by the Senate. In connection with amendment No. 21 the managers desire that the Department include, in its budget for 1955 or in its next supplemental budget request, a proposal for such rewiring and incidental alterations as may be necessary to enable Howard University to use commercial electric power.

##### *Office of Education*

Amendment No. 22—Promotion and further development of vocational education: Provides that not more than \$450,000 shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$2,800,000 instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,926,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25—Payments to school districts: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 26—School construction: Reported in disagreement.

##### *Office of Vocational Rehabilitation*

Amendment No. 27—Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico): Provides that not to exceed \$195,000 shall be available for providing rehabilitation services to disabled residents of the District of Co-

lumbia as proposed by the Senate instead of \$175,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28—Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 29—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$655,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$690,000 as proposed by the House.

#### *Public Health Service*

Amendment No. 30—Tuberculosis: Appropriates \$6,000,000 instead of \$5,725,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,025,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31—Assistance to States, general: Provides that not more than \$2,400,000 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32—Communicable diseases: Provides that not less than \$400,000 shall be used for studies, prevention, and control activities on poliomyelitis as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33—Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: Appropriates \$3,162,500 instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,325,000 as proposed by the Senate. In connection with amendment No. 33 the managers desire that no reduction be made below the 1953 level of activities in connection with inspection of milk shipped in interstate commerce.

Amendment No. 34—Grants for hospital construction: Appropriates \$65,000,000 instead of \$50,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. In connection with amendment No. 34 the managers reaffirm the statements contained in the House and Senate reports in criticism of the "split-project" method of financing by which funds are allocated to start a project with the promise that additional Federal funds will be allocated in future years to finish the project if appropriations are sufficient, thus generating pressure on Congress to appropriate large sums year after year indefinitely.

Amendment No. 35—Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services: Appropriates \$875,000 instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36—Hospitals and medical care: Appropriates \$33,100,000 instead of \$32,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$33,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37—National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 38—National Cancer Institute: Appropriates \$20,237,000 instead of \$17,887,000 as proposed by the House and \$20,487,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39—Mental health activities: Appropriates \$12,095,000 instead of \$10,895,000 as proposed by the House and \$12,345,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40—National Heart Institute: Appropriates \$15,168,000 instead of \$12,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,418,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41—Dental health activities: Appropriates \$1,740,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,650,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 42—Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: Appropriates \$7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 43—Microbiology activities: Appropriates \$5,738,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,479,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44—Neurology and blindness activities: Appropriates \$4,500,000 instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45—Service and supply fund: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to reappropriate unobligated balances of 1953 appropriations for the further capitali-

zation of this fund and restores language proposed by the House to provide for the transfer of other 1954 appropriations for this purpose.

#### *Social Security Administration*

Amendments Nos. 46 and 47—Construction, Bureau of Old-age and Survivors Insurance: Provides funds to prepare for construction of an office building for the Bureau of Old-age and Survivors Insurance as proposed by the Senate rather than providing funds for beginning construction of such a project and authorizing its total cost at not to exceed \$27,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 48—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: Appropriates \$1,550,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49—Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: Appropriates \$1,525,000 instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50—Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to revise the method of allotting funds to States.

#### *Office of the Secretary*

Amendment No. 51—Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: Appropriates \$1,150,000 instead of \$1,075,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,226,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52—Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: Authorizes the transfer of \$171,000 from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund instead of \$168,000 as proposed by the House and \$175,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53—Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel: Authorizes the transfer of \$22,500 from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection services" instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the House and \$25,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54—Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel: Authorizes the transfer of \$365,000 from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund instead of \$355,000 as proposed by the House and \$375,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55—Surplus property disposal: Appropriates \$255,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$450,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56—Working capital fund: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to provide authority to the Secretary for financing additional central services under this fund.

#### *Reductions in Appropriations*

Amendment No. 57—Provides that the unexpended balance of the amount appropriated for school construction surveys under section 101 of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, be rescinded as of December 31, 1953, rather than on the date of approval of this Act as proposed by the House and June 30, 1954, as proposed by the Senate.

#### *General Provisions*

Amendment No. 58—Authorizes the expenditure of not to exceed \$75,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the House and \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 60: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to authorize the Secretary to transfer not to exceed 2½ per centum between appropriations.

Amendment No. 61: Reported in disagreement.

#### **TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD**

Amendment No. 62—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$9,125,000 instead of \$9,000,000



as proposed by the House and \$9,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

**TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD**  
**National Railroad Adjustment Board**

Amendment No. 63—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not less than \$181,000 shall be available for compensation of referees appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the House.

**TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD**

Amendment No. 64—Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust funds): Provides authority to purchase one passenger motor vehicle, for replacement only as proposed by the Senate.

FRED E. BUSBEY,  
BEN F. JENSEN,  
HAMER H. BUDGE,  
JOHN TABER,  
A. M. FERNANDEZ,  
JOHN J. ROONEY,  
CLARENCE CANNON,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1954—CONFERENCE REPORT**

Mr. WILSON of Indiana submitted the following conference report and statement:

**CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 996)**

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5471) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 1, 18, 40, 46, 56, 62, and 65.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 20, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 36, 39, 44, 45, 47, 49, 52, 53, 57, 58, 59, 60, and 61, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,775,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$360,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,230,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$19,730,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "\$124,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,760,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$90,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,835,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$770,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,610,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,465,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,775,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,675,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,485,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "20"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 14, 19, 22, 32, 33, 43, 50, 51, 63, and 64.

EARL WILSON,  
C. W. VURSELL,  
A. OAKLEY HUNTER,  
W. F. NORRELL,  
A. M. FERNANDEZ,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,  
HOMER FERGUSON,  
JOE MCCARTHY,  
FRANCIS CASE,  
LISTER HILL,  
JOHN MCCLELLAN,  
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

**STATEMENT**

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5471) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

**GENERAL ADMINISTRATION**

Amendment No. 1, Executive Office: Strikes out language inserted by the Senate providing for salary increases for the Commissioners and assistants to the Engineering Commissioner.

Amendment No. 2, Executive Office: Appropriates \$418,161 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$414,366 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3, Department of General Administration: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 4, Department of General Administration: Appropriates \$2,775,000 instead of \$2,661,732 as proposed by the House and \$2,909,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Of the increase allowed above the House figure, \$9,600 is for the Budget Office and \$65,000 for the Assessor's Office.

It is the opinion of the conferees of both Houses that the Budget Officer should report directly to the Commissioners.

Amendment No. 5, Ceremony expenses: Appropriates \$10,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$7,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6, Office of the Corporation Counsel: Strikes out language proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7, Office of the Corporation Counsel: Appropriates \$360,000 instead of \$340,278 as proposed by the House and \$372,073 as proposed by the Senate.

**COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT FUND EXPENSES**

Amendment No. 8, District Government retirement and relief funds: Appropriates \$8,823,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,562,000 as proposed by the House.

**REGULATORY AGENCIES**

Amendment No. 9: Inserts language proposed by the Senate to include the Office of Administrator of Rent Control.

Amendments No. 10 and 11: Appropriate \$1,230,000 instead of \$1,191,866 as proposed by the House and \$1,253,108 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that \$23,340 of the amount appropriated shall be available for



payment of terminal leave for the Office of Administrator of Rent Control.

#### PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Amendment No. 12, Operating Expenses: Appropriates \$19,730,000 instead of \$19,655,000 as proposed by the House and \$19,801,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13, Vocational education, George-Barden program: Appropriates \$268,400 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14, Operation and maintenance of buildings, grounds and equipment: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 15, Operation and maintenance of buildings, grounds and equipment: Appropriates \$5,025,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16, Capitol Outlay: Strikes out language proposed by the House and inserts language proposed by the Senate to provide for completion of the third floor of Douglass Junior High School.

Amendment No. 17, Capital Outlay: Appropriates \$124,000 instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$140,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase above the House figure is for a rifle range and school lockers.

#### PUBLIC LIBRARY

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$1,535,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,562,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19, Capital Outlay: Reported in disagreement.

#### RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 20, Operating expenses: Appropriates \$1,589,650 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,555,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21, Capital Outlay: Appropriates \$200,000 instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### METROPOLITAN POLICE

Amendment No. 22: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 23: Strikes out language proposed by the House providing salary increases for technicians.

Amendment No. 24: Strikes out language inserted by the House providing for salary increases for probational detectives.

Amendment No. 25: Inserts language proposed by the Senate to provide for rental, purchase, and maintenance of radio and teletype systems.

Amendments Nos. 26 and 27: Appropriate \$10,760,000 instead of \$10,685,837 as proposed by the House and \$10,843,337 as proposed by the Senate and provide that \$1,400,000 of the amount allowed shall be payable from the Highway Fund. Of the increase allowed above the House figure \$27,000 is for civilian crossing guards.

Amendment No. 28: Provides that \$35,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the House shall be available for expenditure by the Chief of Police for prevention and detection of crime.

#### FIRE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 29, Salaries and expenses: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate to provide for purchase and maintenance of radio equipment.

Amendment No. 30, Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$5,307,841 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,239,841 as proposed by the House.

#### OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$90,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$23,339 as proposed by the House and \$182,351 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 32 and 33: Reported in disagreement.

#### COURTS

Amendment No. 34, District of Columbia Courts: Appropriates \$1,200,000 instead of \$1,175,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,214,300 as proposed by the Senate.

#### HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 35, General Administration: Appropriates \$2,900,000 instead of \$2,843,101 as proposed by the House and \$2,993,101 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36, Operating expenses, Glenn Dale Tuberculosis Sanatorium: Appropriates \$2,579,411 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,544,761 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 37, Operating expenses, Gallinger Hospital: Appropriates \$5,835,000 instead of \$5,825,749 as proposed by the House and \$5,860,749 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38, Medical Charities: Appropriates \$770,000 instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the House and \$787,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Amendment No. 39, Operating expenses: Appropriates \$4,169,353 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,139,353 as proposed by the House.

#### PUBLIC WELFARE

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$99,724 for general administration as proposed by the House instead of \$106,724 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41, Agency services: Appropriates \$4,610,000 instead of \$4,590,796 as proposed by the House and \$4,622,796 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42, Operating expenses, Protective Institutions: Appropriates \$3,465,000 instead of \$3,390,238 as proposed by the House and \$3,490,238 as proposed by the Senate.

#### PUBLIC WORKS

Amendment No. 43, Department of Inspections: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 44, Department of Inspections: Appropriates \$82,900 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$846,081 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 45, Operating expenses, Electrical Division: Appropriates \$1,786,193 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,746,193 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 46, Capital outlay, Electrical Division: Appropriates \$220,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$320,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47, Central Garage: Appropriates \$135,262 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$129,605 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 48, Operating expenses, Street and Bridge Divisions: Appropriates \$2,775,000 instead of \$2,715,673 as proposed by the House and \$2,802,131 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49, Capital outlay, Street and Bridge Divisions: Appropriates \$7,706,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$7,906,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments No. 50 and 51, Capital outlay, Street and Bridge Divisions: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 52, Division of Trees and Parking: Appropriates \$362,575 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$345,770 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 53, Motor-Vehicle Parking Agency: Appropriates \$130,406 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$121,296 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54, Capital outlay, Sewer Division: Appropriates \$5,675,000 instead of \$5,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55, Operating expenses, Water Division: Appropriates \$2,485,000 in-

stead of \$2,478,823 as proposed by the House and \$2,495,323 as proposed by the Senate.

#### NATIONAL GUARD

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates \$115,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$120,700 as proposed by the Senate.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments No. 57, 59, and 60: Change titles, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58: Provides \$20,000 for attendance at meetings as proposed by the Senate instead of \$15,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 61: Provides \$1,000 for Director, Department of Corrections as proposed by the Senate instead of \$750 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 62: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate relating to administrative activities.

Amendments No. 63 and 64: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 65: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate relating to grade increases.

Amendment No. 66: Corrects section number.

EARL WILSON,  
C. W. VURSELL,  
A. OAKLEY HUNTER,  
W. F. NORRELL,  
A. M. FERNANDEZ,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GAVIN and to include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. GOLDEN and to include an editorial.

Mr. BUDGE in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADAIR in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR) and to include an article or a brief written by Miss Sally West.

Mr. HESELTON in four instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska in two instances, in one to include an address on Puerto Rico, entitled "Challenge of the Future," and in the other to include an address by the Governor of Puerto Rico.

Mr. NORBLAD in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter which exceeds the limit. It is 5,400 words. I have not yet received the actual estimate of cost, but may I put the amount in at such time as I get it this afternoon? The amount is \$231.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 29, 1953  
For actions of July 28, 1953  
83rd-1st, No. 142

## CONTENTS

Accounting.....45	Farm program.....12	Penalty mail.....17
Acreage allotments.....10	F.H.A.....35	Personnel.....9,10,16,28,45,46
Agricultural	Food.....37	Postal rates.....17,19
appropriations.....43	Foreign aid.....37	Price supports.....33
Animal diseases.....14	Forestry.....13,14,48	Property.....21,26,32
Appropriations	Fur.....14,39	Reclamation.....18
.....2,10,11,15,43	Immigration.....4,22,41	Research.....24
Contracts.....47	Labor, farm.....3,29	Retirement.....29
Cattle industry.....33	Land laws.....44	Rubber.....20
Commodities.....1,30	Lands, public.....5,36	R.E.A.....11
Corn.....10	Lands, transfer.....24	St. Lawrence seaway.....38
Customs simplification.....23	Legislative program.....25	Surplus commodities.....1,30
Drought relief.....2,10,35	Loans, farm.....6,35	Taxation.....16
Electrification.....11,31	Loans, forestry.....13,48	Trade, foreign.....23
Expenditures.....9	Loans, fur.....14,39	Transportation.....8
Famine relief.....13,30	Loans, home.....27	Veterans' benefits.....27
Farm production.....40	Organization.....42	Water conservation.....34
Farm labor.....3,29	Payrolling.....16	Wheat agreement.....13
Farm prices.....7		

**HIGHLIGHTS:** Senate passed sale of surplus commodities to foreign countries and drought-relief appropriation bills. House Rules Committee cleared famine relief, forest-loans, and Wheat Agreement bills. House committees reported Alaska forest survey, fur-farmer loans, and animal-disease bills. Mexican farm-labor bill sent to conference. House passed immigration bill. House agreed to Senate amendments to customs-simplification bill.

## SENATE

- 1. SURPLUS COMMODITIES.** Passed with amendment S. 2475, which authorizes the President (1) to sell surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies and (2) to convert into dollars foreign currencies acquired by private exporters of such commodities. The total value of CCC stocks and funds which might be made available for these operations would be \$500 million. The Corporation would be reimbursed from appropriations made for that purpose or, in the case of local currencies used for the purposes of the Mutual Security Act, from USA funds. (pp. 10424-37.)
- 2. APPROPRIATIONS.** Passed as reported H. J. Res. 305, the drought-relief appropriation measure (pp. 10423-4). As passed by the Senate, this proposal carries the same amounts as the House version, and there was only one technical amendment. Both Houses agreed to the conference reports on H. R. 5471, the D. C. appropriation bill; H. R. 4663, the first independent offices appropriation bill; and H. R. 5246, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill (pp. 10416-22, 10326-33). These bills will now be sent to the President. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 5805, the legislative-judiciary appropriation bill (S. Rept. 687)(p. 10405).
- 3. FARM LABOR.** Senate and House conferees were appointed on H. R. 3480, to continue



the Mexican farm labor program (pp. 10333-4, 10474).

4. IMMIGRATION. Began debate on S. 1917, to authorize the issuance of special visas to certain refugees, etc. (pp. 10443-73).
5. PUBLIC LANDS. Senate conferees were appointed on S. 1397, to clarify the status of certain mining claims, and S. 2220, to amend the mineral leasing laws with respect to their application in the case of pipelines passing through the public domain (p. 10426).
6. FARM LOANS. Received from this Department a proposed bill to further amend Sec. 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act to authorize the Federal land banks to make a bulk purchase of certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 10405). Also received in the House; to Agriculture Committee (p. 10400).
7. FARM PRICES. Sen. Humphrey inserted local statements favoring more action to assure adequate farm prices (p. 10405).
8. TRANSPORTATION. Agreed, as reported, to S. Res. 140, to provide for a study of transportation facilities in the D. C. area, which had been reported with amendments earlier in the day (S. Rept. 693)(p. 10410).
9. EXPENDITURES; PERSONNEL. The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures submitted a report on Federal employment, etc. (pp. 10411-4).
10. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. In reporting this bill, H. R. 6200 (see Digest 141), the committee took the following actions:  
..... Added an item of \$3,000,000 to formulate and carry out corn acreage allotments for the 1954 crop, compared with a Budget estimate of \$7,500,000. The committee report states: "The Committee is of the opinion that if economy is practiced, the sum of \$3 million will be adequate. However, if it is found that this is not possible, the committee will consider a reasonable supplemental request at the next session of Congress."  
Inserted a provision that the funds appropriated by Public Law 371, 82nd Cong., for drought relief shall remain available until Dec. 31, 1954.  
Added the following general provision: "Funds made available in this or any other Act shall hereafter be available for examination of estimates in the field and the use of such funds for such purpose shall be subject only to regulations by the standing committees concerned."  
Added a general provision limiting the use of chauffeurs.
11. INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL. In reporting this bill, H. R. 4828 (see Digest 141), the House conferees made the following statement regarding Southwestern Power Administration: "None of the funds allowed are to be used for the purpose of implementing existing contracts with REA cooperatives which provide for the lease-purchase of transmission or generating facilities. The funds may be used only for the purchase of electric power and energy and the payment of wheeling service charges at rates and in amounts comparable to those paid in the Southwestern Power Administration area under existing contracts based only on use value received with no additional allowance for purchase or lease of facilities. Such arrangements may be made with REA cooperatives in the area but no funds for this purpose are to be available after February 28, 1954."

HOUSE

12. FARM PROGRAM. On July 27 the Agriculture Committee issued a statement reading in part as follows:





# Congressional Record

United States  
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 99

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 28, 1953

No. 142

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art our companion and counselor, grant that our life in these days may be great in faith, in vision, and in courage for vast multitudes of the human family are watching and waiting for a light to brighten the skyline of their hopes and dreams.

God forbid that we should ever fail to understand that the glorious task of inspiring humanity with lofty ideals and noble principles is far more important and potent in building a better world than any laws and legal codes which we may formulate and enact.

Show us how, in a democracy and a free world, we can make goodness and righteousness imperative. May we be used by Thee in dramatizing the glories of peace and giving moral and spiritual quality to the life of our citizens. Help us to inspire all mankind with greater respect for human personality and a greater reverence for Thee and the majesty and sovereignty of Thy divine will.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 665. An act for the relief of N. A. G. L. Moerings, Mrs. Bertha Johanna Kravenbrink Moerings, and Lambertus Karel Aloysius Josef Moerings;

H. R. 1329. An act for the relief of Arthur Oppenheimer, Jr., and Mrs. Jane Oppenheimer;

H. R. 1806. An act to amend further the Federal Register Act, as amended;

H. R. 2561. An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 by extending the time for filing certain claims thereunder, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2564. An act to make the provisions of section 1362 of title 18 of the United States

Code, relating to injury to or interference with communications systems operated or controlled by the United States, applicable to and within the Canal Zone;

H. R. 3884. An act to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and continue offices in the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 4167. An act to create a Commission to be known as the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission;

H. R. 5303. An act to amend sections 1606 and 1607 of the Internal Revenue Code in order to permit unemployment insurance coverage under State unemployment compensation laws for seamen employed on certain vessels operated by the United States;

H. R. 5636. An act to amend veterans regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for tuberculosis other than pulmonary; and

H. J. Res. 293. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Third International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1456. An act for the relief of Susan Kay Burkhalter, a minor;

H. R. 3429. An act to amend clause (4) of section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 5148. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5877. An act to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1954, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 32. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to increase to \$15 per day the maximum limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official busi-

ness at places other than their official station;

S. 102. An act for the relief of Francesco Cracchiolo;

S. 373. An act to extend the time for filing claims for the return of property under the Trading With the Enemy Act;

S. 539. An act to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to make mandatory the installation of certain railroad communication systems;

S. 850. An act for the relief of Alice Power and Ruby Power;

S. 1009. An act for the relief of Zoltan Weingarten;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of Emmanuel Aristides Nicoloudis;

S. 2249. An act to enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements;

S. 2305. An act to promote safe driving, to eliminate the reckless and financially irresponsible driver from the highways, and to provide for the giving of security and proof of financial responsibility by persons driving or owning vehicles of a type subject to registration under the laws of the District of Columbia;

S. 2315. An act to authorize payment of certain war claims;

S. 2348. An act to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of redcedar shingles";

S. 2408. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes;

S. 2434. An act to amend the Northern Pacific Halibut Act of 1937;

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution authorizing the District of Columbia to enter into interstate civil-defense compacts; and

S. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to liquidate the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.



The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1105) entitled "An act to incorporate the National Safety Council"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1397) entitled "An act to clarify the status of mining claims in areas held under an oil and gas prospecting permit or lease and to encourage the exploration and development of fissionable source minerals"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. ANDERSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2220) entitled "An act to amend section 28 of the act of February 25, 1920, as amended, so as to provide certain exemptions from the requirement that pipelines having rights of way over public lands must be operated as common carriers"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. ANDERSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4828) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 4, 20, 26, 29, 51, and 57, to the above-entitled bill.

#### PRIVATE CAPITAL

(Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to encourage the flow of more private venture capital into small-business enterprises by granting special Federal tax concessions to certain investment groups.

Under this bill, corporations engaged in furnishing venture capital to small businesses would be treated as partnerships under Federal income-tax laws. This means there would be no direct Federal income tax on such corporations, but the net income would be taxed when paid in dividends to stockholders.

Ordinarily, Federal taxes on net profits are levied first against the corporation and again on stockholders' income from dividends from the corporation. My bill would eliminate the first levy for corporations engaged in furnishing venture capital to businesses having not more

than 500 employees or \$2,500,000 paid-in capital.

This proposal is actively sponsored by Gov. Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts, and grows out of a very grave concern over the present difficulty in securing risk capital for business expansion.

I doubt if there is anything the Congress can do which will furnish a greater impetus to our national economic growth than to aid small business to get a start and encourage expansion by passing this legislation to establish for Federal income taxation a new concept of mutual development corporations.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### AMENDING FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6382) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend until June 30, 1954, the period during which the General Services Administration may conduct negotiated sales of surplus property.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this comes from the Committee on Government Operations and was favorably reported out. I am not too familiar with the terms of the bill, but I will not object because, as I understand, it is merely stopgap legislation and the departments are too pushed to write the permanent legislation. Is that about right?

Mr. RIEHLMAN. That is correct. It is just an extension of the present legislation that has been in effect since 1946 and extended each year thereafter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 203 (e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U. S. C. sec. 484 (e)), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1954."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMENDING LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6571) amending the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the appointment of persons to exercise temporarily

the duties of certain offices of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding after section 207 the following new section:

"Sec. 208. (a) In case of a vacancy, from whatever cause, in the office of Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, Postmaster, or Chaplain, of the House of Representatives, or in case of the incapacity or inability of the incumbent of any such office to perform the duties thereof, the Speaker of the House of Representatives may appoint a person to act as, and to exercise temporarily the duties of, Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, Postmaster, or Chaplain, as the case may be, until a person is chosen by the House of Representatives and duly qualifies as Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, Postmaster, or Chaplain, as the case may be, or until the termination of the incapacity or inability of the incumbent.

"(b) Any person appointed pursuant to this section shall exercise all the duties, shall have all the powers, and shall be subject to all the requirements and limitations applicable with respect to one chosen by the House of Representatives to fill the office involved; but nothing in this section shall be held to amend, repeal, or otherwise affect section 7 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1943 (2 U. S. C., sec. 75a).

"(c) Any person appointed pursuant to this section shall be paid the compensation which he would receive if he were chosen, by the House of Representatives to fill the office involved, unless such person is concurrently serving in any office or position the compensation for which is paid from the funds of the United States, in which case he shall receive no compensation for services rendered pursuant to his appointment under this section, and his compensation for performing the duties of such office other than the one to which he is appointed pursuant to this section shall be in full discharge for all services he performs for the United States while serving in such dual capacity."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may meet during the sessions of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent the statement of the managers or part of the House be read in lieu report.

The Clerk read the title of



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 27, 1953.)

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, the conferees of both the Senate and the House have worked long hours to come to an agreement on this conference report. I am very happy to say that the report is unanimously reported by the majority and the minority conferees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

In round figures, the House bill was for \$1,981,000,000. The Senate bill was for \$2,029,000,000. In other words, the Senate bill was \$48 million above the House bill. The conference agreement is \$2,010,000,000, which is \$29 million above the House bill and \$19 million below the Senate bill. With the exception of the National Institutes of Health, the agreement is just about as close to a 50-50 split between the House and the Senate as anyone could get.

On the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, the Senate bill was \$10,500,000 over the House bill. The con-

ference agreement was \$9,500,000 over the House bill for the National Institutes of Health.

There was a difference of \$25 million between the House and the Senate on the item for hospital construction. The House reported and approved \$50 million for hospital construction. The Senate approved \$75 million for hospital construction. The conferees agreed upon \$65 million, which is a little better than 50-50.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert two tables in the RECORD at this point. The first table shows differences for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, and related agencies between the Truman budget, the Eisenhower budget, the House bill, the Senate bill, and the conference agreement. The second table shows the various National Institutes of Health, comparing the Truman budget, the Eisenhower budget, the House bill, the Senate bill, and the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(The tables referred to are as follows:)

	Truman budget	Eisenhower budget	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement
Labor.....	\$296,818,600	\$284,915,600	\$255,184,000	\$263,788,000	\$258,255,000
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	1,786,528,761	1,722,544,870	1,712,248,461	1,751,628,761	1,738,339,261
Related agencies.....	14,715,500	14,053,000	13,274,000	13,524,000	13,399,000
Total.....	2,098,062,861	2,021,513,470	1,980,706,461	2,028,940,761	2,009,993,261

*National institutes of health*

	Truman budget	Eisenhower budget	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement
Operating expenses.....	\$5,180,000	\$4,675,000	\$4,675,000	\$4,675,000	\$4,675,000
Cancer.....	22,000,000	15,780,000	17,887,000	20,487,000	20,237,000
Mental health.....	15,500,000	9,817,000	10,895,000	12,345,000	12,095,000
Heart.....	16,500,000	11,040,000	12,000,000	15,418,000	15,168,000
Dental.....	2,700,000	1,740,000	1,650,000	1,740,000	1,740,000
Arthritis and metabolic diseases.....	8,450,000	4,976,000	5,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Microbiology.....	7,000,000	5,738,000	5,479,200	5,738,000	5,738,000
Neurology and blindness.....	7,670,000	2,574,000	4,000,000	4,750,000	4,500,000
Total.....	85,000,000	56,340,000	61,586,200	72,153,000	71,153,000

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, of necessity all appropriation legislation is a matter of compromise. In this particular bill, however, I think the compromises all the way through have been good with one or two exceptions. One exception, of course, is the Mexican labor program, where the House allowed \$1,250,000 and the Senate conferees agreed to that, which is utterly inadequate.

The other exception is the matter of hospital construction. The compromise ended with the figure of \$65 million as against \$75 million provided in the Senate bill. In that case I feel very strongly that we have not done what we should have done. I think that constitutes a breach of faith, because communities, religious organizations, and institutions all over the country have put on drives to raise money for their share of hospital construction on the faith of the authorization act and the previous prac-

tice of allowing \$75 million annually for this program. We now have broken faith with them and allowed only \$65 million. Of course, under the necessity of coming to a conclusion with this bill, and after three conferences, that figure of \$65 million, which is \$15 million higher than the House provided, and \$10 million less than the Senate figure, has been agreed to by the conferees. The only reason I mentioned it is in the hope that, after we go back home and hear from our home folks, we may come back in January and consider a supplemental amount for that purpose.

Aside from that, I think the bill is a very good bill. I am rather pleased at the fact that the other phases of health, such as the items for the Health Institutes, the bill came out even better than I had expected. For example, with respect to the Cancer Institute, the Truman budget recommended \$22 million, the Eisenhower budget recommended only \$15,780,000 and the House and Senate conferees approved \$20,237,000, al-

most as much as the Truman budget recommended.

Likewise with respect to the Mental Health Institute, which is so important, the Truman budget recommended \$15,500,000; the Eisenhower budget cut it down to \$9,817,000, and the conferees approved \$12,095,000, almost the Truman figures.

For the Heart Institute, the Truman budget recommended \$16,500,000, the Eisenhower budget cut it down to \$11,040,000, and the conferees approved \$15,168,000. The same is true with respect to arthritis and metabolic diseases. The Truman budget recommended \$8,450,000. The Eisenhower budget recommended only about half, \$4,976,000. The conferees approved \$7 million.

For neurology and blindness, the Truman budget recommended \$7,670,000, the Eisenhower budget cut it to \$2,574,000, but after due consideration, the conferees approved \$4,500,000, almost twice what the Eisenhower budget had recommended. So, in the field of health, I think the committee has been, if anything, liberal.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TRIMBLE. What was the final figure on distributive education and vocational education?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to my chairman who has those figures at hand to answer the question.

Mr. BUSBEY. The figure was \$450,000, the same as last year.

Mr. TRIMBLE. And for vocational education?

Mr. BUSBEY. The total for vocational education was \$18,673,261.

Mr. TRIMBLE. That is the conference agreement?

Mr. BUSBEY. That is the conference agreement.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. We realize how hard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] worked on this particular bill. I should like to ask this particular question. In your judgment, will the \$65 million be ample to provide all of the hospitals that had prior commitments made to them?

Mr. BUSBEY. I will answer the gentleman in this manner: As he knows, the coauthor of this bill, Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, was one of the conferees. Senator HILL agreed to the \$65 million figure. I can assure the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] that, in my opinion, if the Senator from Alabama, Mr. HILL, did not believe it was adequate, he would not have agreed to the \$65 million figure.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.



Mr. ADAIR. Is it the intent of the committee that that \$65 million should be used to complete construction on hospitals already begun?

Mr. BUSBEY. That is up to the administration of the program under Dr. Cronin. We ran into quite a problem on the split projects that some of the States had started. In rather drastic language, the report warns them not to start a lot of these large split projects which would prevent small communities from getting their shares of these funds, especially when they have raised money and issued bonds in order to build their hospitals.

Mr. ADAIR. But it is the gentleman's opinion that there is enough money to complete the projects started, or at least carry them forward this year?

Mr. BUSBEY. In my opinion, yes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. With respect to the \$65 million for hospital construction, it is true that Senator HILL and other Senators agreed to that figure, yet I am sure that my chairman will agree with me they did so under very strong compulsion, and we must compliment our chairman for upholding the action of the House. I am satisfied that Senator HILL was no more happy about it than I am.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The item of vocational education is slightly in excess of \$18 million. That is practically the same amount that has been approved for this purpose over the last 4 or 5 years.

Mr. BUSBEY. That is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. May I ask the gentleman, the President indicated his desire that some additional money be supplied for administrative costs in the Department of Education and Welfare. What was done with that in the final agreement?

Mr. BUSBEY. The item for salaries and expenses in the Office of Education was agreed upon at \$2,800,000, which is more than a 50-50 split. The House figure was \$2,500,000, and the Senate figure was \$2,926,000. So, in that instance, we gave in, a little over 50-50, to the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I want to ask about the funds for neurological tests and investigations, such as paralysis, multiple sclerosis, and items of that kind. Are there adequate funds?

Mr. BUSBEY. More than adequate funds, because for all national institutes of health, as I previously reported, the amount was raised \$9½ million above the House figure. The neurological and blindness item was raised from the Eisenhower budget figure of \$2,574,000 to \$4,500,000 in the conference report.

Mr. FULTON. On these other particular research matters, is there enough

in the current appropriation to provide for a full investigation of each of the other diseases where the Government is making an investigation?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes. In each instance, the House committee reported out funds in excess of what was requested in the Eisenhower budget, and the committee's recommendations were approved by the House. The Senate then raised those figures, and we raised the House figures by a total of \$8½ million.

Mr. FULTON. I am in favor of economy, but I do not think that necessary research should be curtailed.

Mr. BUSBEY. I agree with the gentleman. I do not hesitate to say that, if we are going to spend billions and billions in the four corners of the earth, I firmly believe we should spend at least a few millions here to improve the health of our own people and in trying to find the cures for cancer, heart, mental, and other dread diseases.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I would simply like to make this comment, Mr. Speaker, that in this bill we have practically every item which affects the economy and the physical well-being of the people of this Nation. The total figure in the bill is about \$2 billion, as compared with obligations in foreign countries, which is apparently going to occur in this fiscal year, of in excess of \$6 billion.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as one member of this committee I am happy in the knowledge that the conferees gave great consideration, heartfelt consideration, I might say, to the items which deal with health; in fact, we have appropriated in this bill many millions of dollars more than was appropriated in the 1953 fiscal year budget.

Where the health of the American people is concerned, especially in these dread diseases such as we are appropriating for in this bill to provide investigation and research, I have always felt that we are completely justified in being more liberal than in almost any other thing for which we appropriate the taxpayers' dollars. I again say, therefore, that I am completely satisfied with this bill, especially for the Health Department.

I do feel that we did allow a little too much money for some of the other agencies of this Department, but all in all, it is a good bill and the House committee and the Senate committee are well satisfied.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am hereby requesting the Department of Defense, the Command of General Mark Clark in Korea, and General Harrison to take immediate action to locate all the United States prisoners of war and to make every effort to find our United States and United Nations servicemen who are listed as missing in action in Korea.

The relatives of these men are right in their feeling that prompt action will greatly increase the chances of their being found and returned. If hurt or wounded in action, quick steps will materially increase their chance of survival.

Jay Helt, of Pittsburgh, and James J. Balduzzi, of Coraopolis, are both men missing in action in whom I am specially interested, and their parents and friends have urged me to act for prompt action. Ray Sprigle, of Pittsburgh and my district, has particularly asked for quick attention from me and our Government officials.

I speak further for quick action for all the lost and imprisoned servicemen of my district in Korea, as well as for the benefit of the wives and families of all such United States servicemen.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to have the record clear as to the comments in the conference report with reference to the so-called split project method of financing.

It is my definite understanding that this is not intended as a prohibition of such procedure. In fact, I am certain that it will be admitted that such procedure is absolutely essential in some instances, particularly on large projects.

Rather, I understand this to be a warning against possible expansion of state programs to the point of spreading them too thin in any given fiscal year.

Furthermore, I want to call attention to the fact that after this matter was brought up before the House, it adopted the bill extending the program for 2 years, that this bill passed the other body, and that it became law yesterday when the President signed it. This is clear and convincing evidence of approval of the program as it has been administered.

Finally, this approval is further indicated by the inclusion of the figure of \$75,000,000 for fiscal 1954 in this report, in contrast to the \$50,000,000 so provided in the first House action.

#### GRANTS FOR HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the conferees in agreeing to increase the appropriation for the hospital survey and construction program to \$65 million. I am disappointed that the full amount of \$75 million as originally proposed was not agreed to.

The Appropriations Committee of the House recommended \$50 million, which was the amount the House approved when we originally considered this appropriation for this fiscal year. On a motion to recommit, with instructions to report the bill forthwith to provide \$75 million for this fiscal year for hospital-construction program, the motion lost by a small vote, I believe, of 197 to 203. The original budget was \$75 million, and many of us thought it should be sustained.

As I said then, and so did other Members of the House, this program had already been reduced by one-half and no other program of this Government had been so reduced. Certainly no one can consider that adequate hospital facilities are not needed. There is no better way we can provide for the health and welfare of the people.



As the report has stated, the Senate increased the appropriation to \$75 million which was the original budget submitted for this program. It will also be recalled the revised budget by the present administration was \$60 million.

Under the circumstances, the amount agreed to by the conferees provided \$65 million appears to me to be a reasonable compromise.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to specifically refer to the statement of the conferees in connection with this program. The conference report says:

In connection with Amendment 34 the managers reaffirm the statements contained in the House and Senate reports in criticism of the split-project method of financing by which funds are allocated to start a project with the promise that additional Federal funds will be allocated in future years to finish the project if appropriations are sufficient, thus generating pressure on Congress to appropriate large sums year after year indefinitely.

This statement can have no effect as I see it, or import on the program. It merely reiterates the criticism according to the views of certain members of the Committee. Now, just what is the criticism?

The report referred to was filed on May 15, 1953. It refers to the fact that the Committee provided funds because of the split technique of financing. Then the committee says further it had been informed that such financing is technically legal.

Even that might be an expression of view in the form of criticism which is referred to in this conference report, it cannot have any import or adverse effect as to the continued administration of this program under present policy.

The split-project method of financing is necessary in a great many States. Projects developed in the interest of the public in some States require a program with funds provided over a period of more than 1 year.

This is in no way in contravention of the Hospital Construction Act. The act itself provides for the State Agency with the advisory council of that State to conduct surveys and develop hospital programs. Certainly there may have been some errors of judgment, some mistakes may have been made but since it is a continuing program the split project method is considered not only legal but the most appropriate way of providing facilities in many areas.

Furthermore, notwithstanding the report referred to, this Congress has just passed a bill extending the Hospital Survey and Construction Act for a period of 2 years. Thus the Congress has reiterated its approval of the present act for this additional 2-year period. The bill was signed by the President yesterday and it is now law.

I make this statement in view of the language of this report because I think the RECORD should be clear as to what the present law and procedure are. I am sure when members of this Appropriations Committee become a little more familiar with this program and better informed as to its administration, there will be less criticism.

Certainly no one would contend that one session of the Congress would bind another in making appropriations. I do think, however, Mr. Speaker, the Congress has reiterated and again clearly expressed its intent and approval of this program by this more recent action of its extension for another period of 2 years and I might say the conferees have contributed to this by agreeing in conference and bringing to this House this report providing an additional \$15 million more than what was originally provided for by this House.

Again, I wish to compliment the committee for this action.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 14, strike out "Provided, That the compensation of the Solicitor shall be \$14,800 per annum" and insert "Provided, That hereafter the compensation of the Solicitor shall be at the rate equal to the rate established by law for grade GS-18."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 3, line 7, insert "and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 10, line 13, insert:

"Sec. 103. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation in this title may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be used for creation of new functions within the Department."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BUSBEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Sec. 103. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation in this title for salaries and expenses may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be used for creation of new functions within the Department, nor shall the total amount transferred in fiscal year 1954 exceed \$100,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18, line 19, insert: "Sec. 104. Terminal leave: On request of the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer such amounts as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$300,000, from unobligated balances of appropriations for the Department of Labor, fiscal year 1953, to an appropriation account to be established for the payment of annual leave of employees separated from the service as a result of reductions of appropriations provided herein in excess of the average turnover of employees in said Department over the period 1947-1952, to remain available until December 31, 1953."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BUSBEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Sec. 104. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation in this title available for salaries and expenses may be transferred to any other such appropriation for the purpose of paying annual leave of employees separated from the service as a result of reductions of appropriations provided herein, but the transfer authority provided herein shall not extend beyond December 31, 1953."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19. Page 11, line 22, insert:

"For an additional amount for the construction of buildings to accommodate deaf children at the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, \$41,000."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24. Page 15, line 19, after "\$2,926,000" insert "of which not less than \$480,000 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25. Page 15, line 8, after the word "act" insert "": *Provided further*, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and for each succeeding fiscal year, all land lying within the boundaries of the Boulder Canyon Project Reservation shall be considered Federal property within the meaning of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, 2d session; but this proviso shall not be construed as to interfere with State taxation of leasehold interests: *Provided further*, That any tax collected for school purposes on any leasehold interest within the boundaries of the Boulder City Union



School District on and after July 1, 1953, shall be deducted under section 3 (g) of said act."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 15, line 19, insert:

"School construction: The amount made available under this head in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1953, for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies is increased from '\$750,000' to '\$1,250,000.'"

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 17, line 16, after the word "purposes" insert "Provided further, That after payment of amounts certified to be due for prior fiscal years, the funds herein appropriated shall be apportioned among the States in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary to insure equitable maintenance and improvement of State programs; and the obligation of the United States to any State under such act for fiscal year 1954 shall not exceed the amount so apportioned to such State."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BUSBEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Provided further, That after payment of amounts certified to be due for prior fiscal years, the funds herein appropriated shall be apportioned among the States in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary to insure equitable maintenance and improvement of State programs; and the obligation of the United States to any State under such act for fiscal year 1954 shall not exceed the amount so apportioned to such State: *Provided further*, That the amount apportioned to a State for fiscal year 1955 shall not exceed \$1 for each 75 cents contributed by the State for the same purpose."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 37: Page 23, line 7, after the word "others", strike out "and the proceeds thereof may be credited to this appropriation" and insert the following: "at rates determined by him to be sufficient to recover the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be credited to this appropriation."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 34, line 19, after the word "made", insert the following: "Provided, That hereafter appropriations to the Public Health Service for salaries and expenses shall be available for reimbursement to commissioned officers of the Service for the use of taxicabs and other means of conveyance (including reimbursement for use of privately owned vehicles) within and around their designated posts of duty, such reimbursement to be on the same basis and subject to the same limitations as for civilian officers and employees, and subject to the approval of the Surgeon General or his authorized agent."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 61: Page 36, line 3, insert the following:

"Sec. 208. Terminal leave: On request of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer such amounts as may be necessary, but not to exceed a total of \$300,000, from unobligated balances of appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, fiscal year 1953, to an appropriation account to be established for the payment of annual leave of employees separated from the service as a result of reductions of appropriations provided herein in excess of the average turn-over of employees in said Department over the period 1947-1952, to remain available until December 31, 1953."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BUSBEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Sec. 208. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury in this title available for salaries and expenses may be transferred to any other such appropriation for the purpose of paying annual leave of employees separated from the service as a result of reductions of appropriations provided herein, but the transfer authority provided herein shall not extend beyond December 31, 1953."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

#### CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 105 on yesterday I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "nay." I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK], with reference to rollcall No. 101 of July 23, 1953, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected. The

RECORD shows that the gentleman was present. He was not present.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5471) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 27, 1953.)

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the original budget request for the District of Columbia was \$151,564,975. The House bill, in round figures allowed them \$146 million. The Senate bill allowed them \$148 million. After many hours of deliberation and conference we arrived at a compromise figure of about \$147 million, which we felt was a fair compromise on the part of the House.

Does the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], care to use any time?

Mr. NORRELL. I do not care to consume any time, Mr. Speaker. We are in agreement on the bill, and think the conference report should be adopted.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider en bloc Senate amendments Nos. 3, 14, 19, 22, 32, 33, 43, 50, 51, 63, and 64.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 4, line 20, insert "including the rental of postage meters and affiliation with the National Safety Council, Inc."

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 9, line 10, after "equipment" insert "including not to exceed \$25,000 for the purchase and repair of musical instruments and related equipment."

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 11, line 7, insert:

"Capital outlay: For remodeling reading room and for completing renovations in basement, Central Library, \$43,000, to remain available without fiscal year limitation."



Senate amendment No. 22: Page 11, line 23, after "allowances;" insert "the Inspector in charge of the traffic division with the rank and pay of deputy chief; one captain who shall be assigned to the traffic division with the rank and pay of inspector."

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 15, line 8, insert "Provided, That not to exceed \$50,000 of any funds from appropriations available to the District of Columbia may be used to match financial contributions from the Federal Civil Defense Administration to the District of Columbia Office of Civil Defense for the purchase of civil defense equipment and supplies approved by the Federal Civil Defense Administration, when authorized by the Commissioners."

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 15, line 14, insert "Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of existing law, the Administrator of Civil Defense is authorized to coordinate the activities of such office with those civil defense activities located outside the District of Columbia."

Senate amendment No. 43: Page 27, line 2, strike out "two" and insert "four."

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 31, line 8, after "expenses" insert "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the preparation of plans for a crossing of the Potomac River which will be inconsistent with the general plan for the development of Theodore Roosevelt Island adopted and approved under the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 21, 1932."

Senate amendment No. 51: Page 31, line 14, insert "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation or any appropriation heretofore made shall be used to defray the cost of any construction or relocation or removal of railroad track or tracks or the construction of any structure which will prevent continuous rail transportation by standard railroad and equipment between the railroad tracks of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and the premises of the Benning plant of the Potomac Electric Power Co. via the tracks of the East Washington Railway Co. and the Capital Transit Co., except that nothing herein shall be construed to preclude the construction of an overpass at Deane Avenue in compliance with this proviso or to preclude temporary interruption of the railroad transportation service herein described when necessary to any construction on Kenilworth Avenue for which funds are appropriated herein or a relocation of such tracks which will permit such continuous railway transportation."

Senate amendment No. 63: Page 51, line 11, after "and" insert "water-fund."

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 51, line 15, insert:

"Sec. 19. Operating expenses of the Department of Sanitary Engineering properly chargeable to two or more appropriations available to that Department may be charged initially to an appropriate fiscal year account which is hereby authorized to be established. Advances shall be made to this account in such amounts as determined necessary by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia from appropriations available to the Department of Sanitary Engineering. All charges to this account shall be distributed at least monthly to the applicable appropriations."

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules

Committee may have until midnight tonight to file any reports or resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, at the conclusion of any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, at the conclusion of any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House on Thursday, July 30, 1953, for 20 minutes, at the conclusion of any other special orders heretofore entered.

#### FIRST INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1954—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4663) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]?

There was no objection.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 107]

Bolton	Hale	Powell
Frances P.	Hand	Preston
Buckley	Hébert	Prouty
Bush	Jackson	Reece, Tenn.
Celler	Kearney	Reed, Ill.
Chatham	Kilday	Richards
Cotton	Lyle	Schenck
Dies	McCulloch	Sheppard
Dingell	McVey	Taylor
Dolliver	Morrow	Watts
Donovan	Miller, Kans.	Wigglesworth
Fogarty	Oakman	Willis
Gordon	O'Hara, Minn.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### FIRST INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, have I received unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the only points in the entire bill which were under discussion at all were amendment No. 43, at the bottom of page 9, and amendments Nos. 47 and 48 on page 10. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read that portion of the report and that the rest of the report be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 27, 1953.)

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the two items which the Clerk read from the statement on the part of the managers had to do with the Interstate Commerce Commission and with the Public Housing Administration. Those were the two items that were in conference.

The Interstate Commerce Commission discussion was brought about, and the bill was returned to conference, because of some confusion over the wording which the House had put into its report. There was nothing in the bill. It was a very firm recommendation in the report, and the confusion grew out of the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission apparently gave out the word that if the 18 inspectors which they have for the entire United States were to be put at something more useful they would have to close 76 offices. The House willingly took out that language and accepted the Senate recommendation that the Interstate Commerce Commission adopt and put into effect the provisions of the Wolf report, which is just as satisfactory to the House. That is the recommendation of the conference report that comes before you now. There was a slight change in the amount of money appropriated for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

In the housing matter there is no change in the number of housing units to be started, and no change in the wording which the House has already adopted. The only addition is a sentence in the House report which says that the conferees realize that one Congress cannot bind another Congress on this or any other program.

We discussed this so fully when it was before the House that I have nothing else to say at this time.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. I asked the gentleman to yield in order that I might inquire whether the conference provides a sufficient number of public housing units to provide shelter for the proposed 240,000 that we are planning to bring into this country above and beyond the



provisions of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman's question presumes that the bill is going to be passed. I think probably we should wait until the bill is passed to see how many houses will be needed. I do not think they will be built out of public housing.

Mr. WHEELER. Assuming that the so-called DP Act does pass, would the gentleman say there are a sufficient number of public housing units provided in the conference report to house the proposed number that is to be brought in under the DP Act?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman thinks there are plenty of housing units already built at Federal expense.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. In reading the statement of the managers on the part of the House, I agree there are only two amendments that are in disagreement, but it appears to me that all the other amendments are concerned with the amount of travel.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There were more on that subject than any other.

Mr. SADLAK. I wonder why that is so. Is there more travel or is there a new criterion?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman has asked a very good question. There has been a constant increase, over the years, in the money spent for travel. So, last year the House committee recommended, and the House supported the committee, in cutting that down one-third.

This year we again included a general provision to cut travel down a third again. When the bill went to the Senate, these items were increased, and in the conference we took them up item by item, allowed a little here, took off a little there. The result was a compromise between the Senate figures and our figures. It is a reduction in the amount of travel, but it is a more reasonable and a more orderly reduction.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. In my district, in the city of Aberdeen, Wash., there is a housing project under construction of some 50 homes. My question is: Is there anything in this bill that would prevent completion of that housing project that is now 52-percent completed?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No; if it has been started it is obviously under contract and therefore, would continue.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The contracts would not be canceled.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We are not suggesting canceling any contracts which are under actual construction.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the full 10 minutes. I want only to make a brief comment in the nature

of an epitaph over the remains of the public-housing program.

The conferees have just returned from reexamining this bill. The bill is exactly as it was when the House voted upon it. The only action taken by the conferees was to insert additional verbiage in the report in an effort to make palatable a provision which is difficult to swallow. The report now contains the additional statement that this Congress cannot bind future Congresses—an utterance which all of us will recognize to be a real contribution toward shedding light on this complex question. We now know that the conferees recognize the principle that the Constitution of the United States is still the Constitution of the United States.

I do not think we can escape the realization that we are burying the public-housing program today. Make no mistake about it. Those who say this is not a destruction of the program are running from reality; the 20,000 units which are authorized for construction in this bill are the terminal units. No additional units can be built next year unless the Congress affirmatively acts to authorize such construction. More than that, the making of additional contracts, preliminary or otherwise, is forbidden, an action which effectively stops up the pipeline of all activity. It takes several years to prepare a program for public-housing construction. If next year the Congress in its wisdom decides to construct 35,000 units, there will be not enough units in the pipeline to permit the Congress' will to be carried out. Presumably, there are 62,000 units in the pipeline. This bill authorizes the construction of 20,000 such units, apparently leaving 42,000 units, but the apparent existence of the 42,000 units is only a mirage. The city of Los Angeles is sur-rendering approximately 6,000 units. It is anticipated that another 15,000 of the units under contract will be impossible of fulfillment for one reason or another. The remaining 20,000 units under contract will have to be placed in some kind of a housing limbo, pending the further action of the Congress. Now the question is raised whether the Federal Government intends to live up to its obligations under the contracts. Will the Federal Government abide by its contracts or will it welsh on its agreements? That question is not resolved by this bill. Doubt is present as to what the Government intends to do, where none existed heretofore.

This is a most unfortunate situation. The eradication of this program places an almost insurmountable roadblock in the path of the undertaking by private enterprise to clear the slums which are the shame of the cities. Slum clearance is a private-enterprise activity, but some public housing is necessary to complete slum-clearance programs. Let us see what this bill does to city planning. Those of us who have followed the progress of municipal-housing rehabilitation know about the so-called Baltimore plan—the effort of the great city in Maryland to pick itself up by its civic bootstraps and eliminate its slums and its bad housing. Let me read you a copy

of the letter addressed to the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Independent Offices, Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, which I received this morning. I read it to show the destructive impact of the action of the conferees upon the plan of the city of Baltimore and of every city in the Nation which is interested in modernizing its community. This is a letter from Mrs. Corner, chairman of the Baltimore Committee on Housing Legislation, dated July 27, 1953:

The Baltimore Committee on Housing Legislation has already protested the first conference report on the first independent offices appropriation bill. We are delighted, therefore, that the Senate has given the conferees an opportunity to reconsider their action.

Baltimore's attack on its slum problem has become famous throughout the Nation. Public housing is an integral part of this attack. The 2 redevelopment projects now under way, which have cleared 47 acres of slums, could not have been started had we not been able to relocate many of the families living in these areas in public housing projects. A third redevelopment project, which will displace more than 1,000 families, many eligible for low-rent public housing, will probably be started this fall. Additional large areas have also been officially designated for demolition by the Baltimore City Council. These areas are those which the planning commission, after careful study, determined were too far gone for rehabilitation under our law-enforcement program, which will eventually treat the remainder of our 2,000 blocks of slums and blight.

You can see from this brief summary that Baltimore has a comprehensive, soundly conceived program for the rehabilitation and rebuilding of the city. We have tried as a community to look ahead and plan carefully, using all the tools of civic improvement at our command. Public housing is such a tool, and the city's program is predicated on an eventual total of 10,000 units under the Housing Act of 1949. By a unanimous vote, the housing authority has been instructed by the city council to plan for this number. We have now passed the halfway mark, with almost 5,000 units already constructed, and considerable sums spent in planning future projects. It is important to the entire Baltimore community that this program be allowed to proceed and that Congress make no restrictions which will prevent sound future planning. This means, particularly, that the Federal Government should be authorized to enter into loan contracts for future construction as well as to build a specified number during the current year. Without such contracts the advance planning necessary for a sound program cannot be done either in Baltimore or elsewhere.

Regardless of the figure for new starts agreed upon by the conferees, which we hope will be close to the 35,000 requested by President Eisenhower, we urge you, in the public interest, to remove the proviso in the first conference report which would have closed the pipeline by prohibiting any new loan or annual contributions contracts.

If Congress desires to terminate the program, let this be done through amendment of the Housing Act itself, not by an appropriation bill.

It can be seen that by action of the Congress in this bill municipal slum-clearance programs are now greatly retarded or killed altogether.

The relocation problem is a most difficult one at best. Without a public-housing program, the job of clearing the slums becomes almost impossible.



Mr. Speaker, I am not disposed to detain the House any longer, but, I repeat, we have committed a grave mistake in adopting this conference report. However, in view of the fact that the House has already voted on this provision of the bill, and in view of the fact that the conferees made no changes in the bill, I shall not ask for another rollcall vote on this matter.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, this conference report cuts out at least 2,675 housing units from my district in Jefferson County, Ala. The House voted to eliminate all public housing, but the conferees compromised with the Senate and agreed to the construction of 20,000 units this year. Mr. Speaker, it is clear here today that the House is going along with the 20,000 units, but I must respectfully point out that as the situation now stands Alabama and especially Jefferson County will be hit a very, very hard blow. Alabama, South Carolina, and possibly other States will lose just about all the units under planning at this time as they have not reached the stage of executed Federal-State contributions contracts and as I understand it even those are in doubt. Passing this report which does not even set up a system of proportionate distribution means penalizing communities that have invested time, money, and effort in these projects, to say nothing of the money the Federal Government has already spent for planning surveys. As I said, in the Ninth Congressional District of Alabama alone there is at least 2,675 units that come under this category. They include Adamsville, 115; Birmingham, 2,000; Brookside, 6; Gardendale, 62; Graysville, 74; Kimberly, 62; Leeds, 18; Mulga, 230; Trussville, 34; and Warrior, 74.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a lot more that I can say in this one-half minute allotted to me today, but I protest discrimination against Alabama and Jefferson County and hope the Republicans will devise a fair system of distribution of these 20,000 units.

(Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, my position on this matter is very well known. I think we make a great mistake in social policy in adopting this report and cutting off the public housing program. I realize the situation, that the House has spoken.

But I do not join with my colleague from Illinois in interring the Federal public housing program. On the contrary, I point out that in 1937 we authorized a Federal public housing program, and it subsequently lay dormant for almost 10 years. In 1949 it was revived. I was happy to be the House sponsor of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Act which was ultimately adopted by the House in 1949.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I would say to the gentleman that if it is revived it will have to be as a result of the Democratic Party taking control of the Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not agree with that at all. I have pointed out before and I point out again that you could never get the Federal public-housing program through without Republican votes, as you had to have before. This is not a question of party. It is a question of a social point of view. A Federal public-housing program is important enough in proportion to the total housing in the United States that its vitality will, I believe, bring it out for further consideration.

I should like to make one other point which I direct seriously to the chairman of the subcommittee. The United States took, as I see it, firm obligations in a governmental sense under the terms of the law and their expressed intent to build the units for which it made annual contributions contracts. Under this conference report the Congress is allowing only about two-fifths of the total under annual contributions contracts to be built. It seems to me that we are in duty bound, both morally and ethically and according to the terms of the law, to construct the balance of this housing. Many municipalities have put much effort and investment into these projected developments.

I look forward to two things: First, that the vitality of this Federal public-housing program will bring about its restoration, and, second, that we will authorize the construction of all those projects which are under annual contribution contracts that are so essential to slum clearance and urban redevelopment and on which enormous amounts of work have been done.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. REGAN. May I say to the gentleman that it would not be all of the Democrats who would vote for revival of this public-housing proposition.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand that. I think every Member knows that I consider every Member just as sincere as I am. Many of these programs do not divide down the middle of the aisle. They represent sectional and social points of view. As keenly as I feel on this subject of Federal public housing as a part of our total housing program including municipal and State projects, in justice to the people of our country, I know Members from some other communities feel just as keenly the other way.

I think it very important that we do not give up on our Federal public-housing program. I hope very much that my colleague from Illinois will work just as hard as I will to see that the Congress—whether Republican of my party, or Democrat of his party—will do what is just for the American people and that a fair percentage of the total housing for the country in Federal public-housing will be effectuated.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I can only say to the gentleman that there certainly is no doubt as to my position in favor of the public-housing program. Now, in regard to what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN] said, let me state that all Democrats who follow the platform of the Democratic Party will be for public housing.

Mr. JAVITS. And I may also say that the Republicans who voted for the Housing Act of 1949 felt the same way about the Republican platform.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I hope the gentleman from Illinois will again back the program heartily and see that it goes through to a successful conclusion.

Mr. JAVITS. I trust that all men of good will will back the program.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman from California stated that the language in the committee report, which some of us felt prohibited the use of funds for safety and enforcement by the Interstate Commerce Commission, had been stricken.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. In the same statement the gentleman said that the item had been reduced by a good many thousand dollars. That is not the money that would be used for that purpose, is it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Additional money was put in by the Senate, over and above the House figure, in order to put into effect the Wolf recommendations. That money was reduced \$65,000, which still leaves more than the House figure, and about \$300,000 more than last year.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. So that the money for the enforcement and safety work is still in the bill?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. The \$65,000 came out of the additional sum put in by the Senate. The money allowed by the House for the safety function was not reduced.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMENDING THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and



agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOPE, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, HILL, COOLEY, and POAGE.

#### IMPORTATION OF TUNA PRODUCTS

(Mr. WILSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is increasingly evident that definite action must be taken with respect to the imposition of a duty and/or quota on the importation of tuna products. With this in mind I have introduced H. R. 6546, designed to place a needed overall quota on all types of tuna products imported into this country.

In introducing this bill and providing background for it, it is well to look at the current import figures:

For the first 5 months of 1953 frozen tuna imports totaled 32,653,000 pounds. This represented an increase of 34 percent over the highest comparable period and of 39 percent over 1952. Actually, there are only 3 years of record in which the annual total of frozen imports have exceeded this year's 5-month total.

For the same 5-months period canned tuna imports—in oil and in brine—totaled 11,952,000 pounds, or an increase of 19 percent over the highest comparable period which was in 1952.

There is no sign of any abatement in this growing increase in imports, either in relative or actual quantities. The latest announcement from Japan, the leading supplier of tuna products, is that current plans call for 72 million pounds of frozen tuna to be exported within a year, which amount is higher than the total of any single year's imports from all countries sending frozen tuna to the United States.

The goal on canned goods is approximately 30 million pounds of processed weight. This again is a figure beyond any year except 1950, when announcement of the end of the United States-Mexico Trade Agreement was made causing a most unusual situation, which, according to the United States Tariff Commission "gave an added stimulus to imports during the remainder of the year."

The most alarming thing about these estimates of exports is not only the fact that they are far beyond any previous year's total exports, but that they are given before the productive potential of the new Japanese fleet is realized. There is a program of purchasing motherships from this country which has been and is being actively followed. There is a major program of fishing vessel construction, which construction program has the financial assistance of the Japanese Government. It is only logical to assume that the export goals announced are only the beginning of much larger amounts possible when the additional productive facilities of the Japanese fleet are realized. Significantly, at this same time no new construction of major ves-

sels is being undertaken by the American tuna industry and not one new keel has been laid for a new vessel within the past 2 years.

In its report to the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate in March 1953, the Tariff Commission stated in part:

The extent to which the domestic tuna fleet and industry are exposed to foreign competition is actually governed by imports of both the raw and canned fish and it follows from what has been said that any desired limitation on imports of fresh or frozen tuna by the United States could probably be accomplished under present conditions more certainly by means of quotas rather than by duties.

The situation requires correction and some new thinking.

I have introduced H. R. 6546, designed to provide an overall solution by regulating the total quantity of tuna products which may be imported into the United States in any form and by providing a sliding scale whereby importations may be increased in absolute quantities as the market grows.

These are the things which H. R. 6546 will do:

First. Permit the entry of imported tuna products in all forms to come in at about the highest level they have reached, the equivalent of 120 million pounds of round weight.

Second. Permit the entry of amounts in excess of this quantity by the provision of a percentage share of the market, which would become operative as the average apparent annual consumption increases.

Third. Establish the percentage at 25 percent, which would be approximately double the prewar annual average.

Fourth. Establish the absolute quantity quota for the present at 120 million pounds of round weight, which would be more than 4 times the average of the prewar exportations to this country.

Fifth. Limit imports for the present to 120 million pounds until the apparent average annual consumption rises above the 480-million-pound mark, which could take place within the next year and a half.

Sixth. Permit the duty-free importation of frozen tuna from Peru and other American Republics up to a rate of 5 percent of the market, based on the preceding 5 years. In 1953 this would permit the importation of 21,200,000 pounds, a significant increase when compared to the total of 15,600,000 pounds actually received in 1952 and a 5-year average of 13,400,000 pounds.

#### GOVERNMENT-OWNED RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5728) to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 27, 1953.)

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under the conference report on the so-called rubber bill a commission of 3 is set up by the President, at the pay of \$50 per diem, to advertise for bids from prospective buyers of the synthetic rubber plants of this country that were established and have been built up and developed during and since World War II.

That bidding period must continue for not less than 6 months in order to give small concerns or corporations as well as the larger ones an opportunity to bid.

After the bids have been received, the Commission, working in constant consultation and close cooperation with the Attorney General of the United States in order to produce a free, competitive synthetic industry in this country, making sure that there is no violation of the antitrust laws, has a period of not less than 7 months to negotiate with these prospective buyers.

The report of the Commission must be submitted to the Congress not later than January 31, 1955. You will recall that the House bill required that the report should be made by May 1, 1954, but I think the Senate was wise in extending the time in order to dispose of such a large industry. It gives everybody ample time and fair chance to bid. The House receded and agreed to the Senate amendment granting until January 31, 1955, for the Commission to submit its report to the Congress.

When that report is submitted and referred respectively to the Armed Services Committee of the House and the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, any Member of either body has the privilege of introducing a resolution registering disapproval of the same. If the committee to which the resolution is referred does not act within 10 days, the committee may be discharged and the resolution called up on the floor. If 30 days elapse and no resolution of disapproval is adopted by either House of the Congress, then the recommendations in the report are to be carried out and the sales consummated.

I want each Member to bear in mind that any Member has the right to introduce this privileged resolution of disapproval. But if either the House or the Senate rejects or disapproves the proposed sale, then the Rubber Act of 1948 will automatically be extended until March 31, 1956.

I might say that when the House conferees met with the Senate conferees yesterday we went into this matter very thoroughly and we reached this accord without too much wrangling or debate.

Once more I want to remind the Members of the House that we came dangerously near losing World War II when Malaya fell and the supply of our natural rubber was cut off. But when big Bill Jeffers brought order out of chaos and developed this synthetic industry at a cost of \$700 million, which we have built up and which is now a going concern, it saved not only our necks in World War







Public Law 170 - 83d Congress  
Chapter 296 - 1st Session  
H. R. 5246

AN ACT

All 67 Stat. 245.

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, namely:

Departments of  
Labor and Health,  
Education, and  
Welfare Appropria-  
tion Act, 1954.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Department of  
Labor  
Appropriation  
Act, 1954.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); teletype news service; any payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; \$1,350,000.

60 Stat. 810.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, \$1,475,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the compensation of the Solicitor shall be at a rate equal to the rate established by law for grade GS-18.

BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; performance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 784 (c)); performance of the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)); and not to exceed \$70,000 for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as authorized by the Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), including purchase of reports and of material for informational exhibits and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards; \$700,000.

63 Stat. 865.

61 Stat. 136.

BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to render assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment rights under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 308), the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as amended, and section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and, under the Act of June 23, 1943, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1472), of persons who have performed service in the Merchant Marine, \$300,000.

54 Stat. 890.

55 Stat. 626.

50 USC app. 362.

54 Stat. 858.

50 USC app.

401-405.

62 Stat. 614;

65 Stat. 75.

50 USC app. 459.

57 Stat. 162.



BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging apprentice training, as authorized by the Act of August 16, 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50), \$3,230,000.

50 Stat. 664.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$5,300,000, of which \$1,100,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

60 Stat. 810.

58 Stat. 293.

38 USC 695-695f.

48 Stat. 113.

38 USC 695b.

49 Stat. 626.

38 USC 991-999.

42 USC 502.

42 USC 503.

Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: For grants in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including, upon the request of any State, the purchase of equipment and the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, for necessary expenses in connection with the operation of employment office facilities and services in the District of Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684), \$192,205,000, of which \$6,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that the Secretary finds necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from changes in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid over those upon which the State's basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Columbia) was based, which increased costs of administration cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secretary of Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State found to be in compliance with the requirements of the Act of June 6, 1933, and, except in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, with the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its unemployment compensation law and of its public employment offices: *Provided further*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Department of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail matter in connection with the administration of unemployment compensation systems and employment services by States receiving grants herefrom.

Personnel standards.

State agencies for grants-in-aid.

In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6, 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall apply.

None of the funds appropriated by this title to the Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State agencies to cover, in

whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

49 Stat. 626.  
42 USC 501-503.  
48 Stat. 113.  
29 USC 49-49n.

Unemployment compensation for veterans: For payments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, \$38,500,000.

66 Stat. 684.  
38 USC 991-999.

Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program: For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under the Act of July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78), including temporary employment of persons without regard to the civil service laws, \$1,250,000.

65 Stat. 119.  
7 USC 1461-1468.

#### BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative expenses and not to exceed \$87,000 for the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board, \$2,000,000, together with not to exceed \$90,000 to be derived from the War Claims Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

62 Stat. 1247.  
50 USC app. 2012.

Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of compensation and other benefits and expenses (except administrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing during the current or any prior fiscal year, including payments to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital services pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation; continuation of payment of benefits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in third-party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital services and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial expenses, including transportation and other expenses incidental to such services, treatment, and burial, for such enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital services and treatment at Government expense on June 30, 1943, and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian employees of the United States, and the limitations and authority of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 796), shall apply in providing such services, treatment, and expenses in such cases; such amount as may be required during the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for payments pursuant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012) and shall be credited with advances or reimbursements therefor from the War Claims Fund created by section 13 (a) of said War Claims Act of 1948.

60 Stat. 696.

39 Stat. 742.

50 USC app. 2003, 2004.



BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$5,345,000.

60 Stat. 810.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of reports and material for informational exhibits, \$350,000.

41 Stat. 987.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for performing the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, approved June 30, 1937, as amended (41 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for expenses of attendance of co-operating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Division, \$6,250,000.

52 Stat. 1060.  
29 USC 201.

49 Stat. 2036.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field, and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

60 Stat. 810.

Transfer of funds.

SEC. 103. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation in this title for salaries and expenses may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfer: *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be used for creation of new functions within the Department, nor shall the total amount transferred in fiscal year 1954 exceed \$100,000.

Leave payments.

SEC. 104. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation in this title available for salaries and expenses may be transferred to any other such appropriation for the purpose of paying annual leave of employees separated from the service as a result of reductions of appropriations provided herein, but the transfer authority provided herein shall not extend beyond December 31, 1953.

Citation of title.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1954".

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1954.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), \$175,000.

41 Stat. 272.

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Columbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improvements, \$410,000: *Provided*, That the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, shall be paid by the District of Columbia, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, at the rate of \$1,150 per school year for each student attending said Institution pursuant to the Act of March 1, 1901 (31 D. C. Code 1008).

31 Stat. 844.

For an additional amount for the construction of buildings to accommodate deaf children at the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, \$41,000.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392); the Tea Importation Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50); the Import Milk Act (21 U. S. C. 141-149); the Federal Caustic Poison Act (15 U. S. C. 401-411); and the Filled Milk Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64); reporting and illustrating the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment; not exceed \$2,000 for payment in advance for special test and analyses by contract; and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement operations; \$5,200,000.

52 Stat. 1040;  
29 Stat. 604;  
44 Stat. 1101,  
1406; 42 Stat.  
1486.

Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection services: For expenses necessary for the certification or inspection of certain products in accordance with sections 406, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346, 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of the advance deposits during the current fiscal year to cover payment of fees by applicants for certification or inspection of such products, to remain available until expended. The total amount herein appropriated shall be available for personal services; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment; and the refund of advance deposits for which no service has been rendered.

52 Stat. 1049;  
55 Stat. 851;  
59 Stat. 463.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard University" for salaries of technical and professional personnel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such university; \$3,104,000: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary from any other appropriation in this title: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed upon him by the foregoing proviso.

Salary re-  
striction.

Payment by  
District of  
Columbia.



HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Howard University, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds, \$2,535,000.

Construction of buildings: For the purchase and installation of a vacuum pump in the steam system, \$20,000.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Promotion and further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15), section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30), and the Act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462), \$18,673,261: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$18,498,261 for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That not more than \$450,000 of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations.

Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended, \$2,501,500.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of public and school library service; coordination of library service on the national level with other forms of adult education; developing library participation in Federal projects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research materials among libraries, interstate library coordination and the development of library service throughout the country; purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education, and repairing the same; \$2,800,000, of which not less than \$480,000 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized: *Provided*, That all receipts from non-Federal agencies representing reimbursement for expenses of travel of employees of the Office of Education performing advisory functions to the said agencies shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of this appropriation.

Payments to school districts: For payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), \$66,500,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of such Act: *Provided further*, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and for each succeeding fiscal year, all land lying within the boundaries of the Boulder Canyon Project Reservation shall be considered Federal property within the meaning of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, second session; but this proviso shall not be construed as to interfere with State taxation of leasehold interests: *Provided further*, That any tax collected for school purposes on any leasehold interest within the boundaries of the Boulder City Union School District on and after July 1, 1953, shall be deducted under section 3 (g) of said Act.

School construction: The amount made available under this head in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1953, for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies is increased from "\$750,000" to "\$1,250,000".

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4), including payments, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accordance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for the use of blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be controlled by the State agency, \$23,000,000, of which not to exceed \$195,000 shall be available to the Secretary for providing rehabilitation services to disabled residents of the District of Columbia, as authorized by section 6 of said Act, which latter amount shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with providing such services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15 per centum of the appropriation shall be used for administrative purposes: *Provided further*, That after payment of amounts certified to be due for prior fiscal years, the funds herein appropriated shall be apportioned among the States in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary to insure equitable maintenance and improvement of State programs; and the obligation of the United States to any State under such Act for fiscal year 1954 shall not exceed the amount so apportioned to such State: *Provided further*, That the amount apportioned to a State for fiscal year 1955 shall not exceed one dollar for each 75 cents contributed by the State for the same purpose.

57 Stat. 374.

29 USC 33.

29 USC 36.

Apportionment  
to States.

Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (including the objects specified in the preceding paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

29 USC 41.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including not to exceed \$3,000 for production, purchase, and distribution of educational films; \$655,500.

29 USC 41.

49 Stat. 1559.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and other Acts, including expenses for active commissioned officers in the Reserve Corps and for not to exceed one thousand five hundred commissioned officers in the Regular Corps; as follows:

58 Stat. 682.

Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases including the operation and maintenance of centers for the diagnosis and treatment of persons afflicted with venereal diseases; and for grants of money, services, supplies, equipment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the Act, and with the approval of the respective State health authorities, to counties, health districts, and other political subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon General may determine; \$5,000,000.

42 USC 246,  
266.



All 67 Stat. 252.

42 USC 246. Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314 (b) of the Act, \$6,000,000.

42 USC 246. Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes, not otherwise specifically provided for, of section 314 (c) of the Act; to provide  
42 USC 243. consultative services to States pursuant to section 311 of the Act; to  
42 USC 241. make field investigations and demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the Act; and to provide for collecting and compiling mortality, morbidity, and vital statistics; \$13,250,000, of which not more than \$2,400,000 shall be available for personal services.

42 USC 241, Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as otherwise provided  
243, 264. for, those provisions of sections 301, 311, and 361 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression of communicable and preventable diseases, and the interstate transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$5,000,000, of which not less than \$400,000 shall be used for studies, prevention, and control activities on poliomyelitis.

42 USC 241, Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For expenses, not  
243, 246, 264. otherwise provided, necessary to carry out those provisions of sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of the Act relating to sanitation and other aspects of environmental health, including enforcement of applicable quarantine laws and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carrying out the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466-466 (j)); \$3,162,500.

42 USC 241, Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of  
243, 246, 264, Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct, in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases, and the establishment and maintenance of health and sanitation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361 and 363 of the Act, including the hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft, and the purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable buildings, \$1,082,000.

60 Stat. 1042. Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hospital construction under part C, title VI, of the Act, as amended, to remain  
42 USC 291d- available until expended, \$65,000,000: *Provided*, That allotments under  
291h. such part C to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of an amount equal to the appropriation granted herein.

Grants for hospital construction (liquidation of contract authorization): For payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head, \$19,700,000.

60 Stat. 1041. Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services: For salaries  
42 USC 291- and expenses incident to carrying out title VI of the Act, as amended,  
291h. \$875,000.

60 Stat. 903. Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the functions of the  
42 USC 248, Public Health Service under the Act of August 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150),  
249, 251, 253, and under sections 321, 322, 324, 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and  
255-257, 259, 710 of the Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079 of  
260, 220, 222, February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of farm products  
249 note; and livestock; conducting research on technical nursing standards and  
33 USC 763o. furnishing consultative nursing services; and purchase of firearms and  
3 CFR, 1943 ammunition; \$33,100,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall be exclusively  
Cum. Supp., available for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care and treatment  
p. 1101. of persons afflicted with leprosy: *Provided*, That when the Public Health Service establishes or operates a health service program for

any department or agency, payment for the estimated cost shall be made in advance for deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the purposes of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to preventing the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign countries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance with section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of the Public Health Service are not available, including insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; \$2,900,000.

National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not otherwise provided for, including research fellowships and grants for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act; not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection of temporary structures; and grants of therapeutic and chemical substances for demonstrations and research; \$4,675,000: *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to advance to this appropriation from other appropriations to the Public Health Service such amounts as are determined to be necessary for the foregoing purposes and for activities performed on a centralized basis: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to operate facilities at the National Institutes of Health for the sale of meals to employees and others at rates determined by him to be sufficient to recover the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be credited to this appropriation.

National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon General, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer by providing consultative services, demonstrations, and grants-in-aid; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A, of the Act; \$20,237,000.

Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311, 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases, \$12,095,000.

National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act, \$15,168,000.

Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental diseases and conditions, \$1,740,000.

Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, \$7,000,000.

Microbiology activities: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to microbiology, including the regulation and preparation of biologic products, \$5,738,000.

Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to neurology and blindness, \$4,500,000.

Construction of research facilities (liquidation of contract authorization): for payment of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted to enter into contracts for construction of a combined hospital and research building as authorized in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Acts of 1949 and 1950, to be transferred to the General Services Administration, \$2,500,000.



Recall to  
active duty.

Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay of commissioned officers, as authorized by law, \$1,197,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That hereafter a commissioned officer of the Public Health Service who has been retired may be recalled to active duty, other than in time of war, with his consent.

Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous expenses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and publications related to public health; conducting studies and demonstrations in public health methods; and carrying on international health activities, including not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of officials of other countries when specifically authorized by the Surgeon General; \$2,900,000.

59 Stat. 370.

Service and supply fund: For additional working capital for the "Service and supply fund," created by title II of the Act of July 3, 1945 (42 U. S. C. 231), not to exceed \$200,000, to be derived by transfer from such other funds appropriated in this Act to the National Institutes of Health as the Surgeon General may determine, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any stocks of supplies and equipment of the Public Health Service related to services financed under this fund may also be used to capitalize said fund.

Transfer of  
appropriations.

Administrative provisions: During the current fiscal year, and with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, there may be transferred from any annual appropriation to the Public Health Service to any other such appropriation such additional amounts as may be required for pay and allowances of the active commissioned officers herein authorized, but any amounts so transferred shall not exceed 5 per centum of any such appropriation and no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum as a result of any such transfers.

#### SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of the hospital, including purchase of clothing for patients and cooperation with organizations or individuals in the scientific research into the nature, causes, prevention and treatment of mental illness, \$2,417,000.

Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds: For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including preparation of plans and specifications, advertising, and supervision of construction, \$399,500: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be transferred to the General Services Administration.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: For necessary expenses, including furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equipment used by building guards; not more than \$62,750,000 may be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: For preparing for construction of an office building and appurtenant facilities for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, including equipment, acquisition of land (including donations thereof), and preparation of plans and specifications, \$1,500,000, to be derived from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and to remain available until expended.

Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV, X, and XIV), \$1,340,000,000, of which such amount as may be necessary shall be available for grants for any period in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year. 49 Stat. 620; 64 Stat. 555.

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance, \$1,550,000.

Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6), and title V of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), including purchase of reports and material for the publications of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution, \$1,525,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry out any instructions, order, or regulation relating to the care of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*, That any State plan which provides standards for professional obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State shall be approved. 37 Stat. 79. 49 Stat. 629. Obstetrical cases.

Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For grants to States for maternal and child-health services, services for crippled children, and child-welfare services as authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), \$30,000,000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not be included in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount expended or estimated to be expended by the State. 49 Stat. 629. 42 USC 702, 712, 704, 714.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner for Social Security, \$173,000, together with not to exceed \$123,500 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Operating fund, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions: For additional working capital for the fund established by section 5 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U. S. C. 1755), \$250,000, to be available for the purposes of such fund without fiscal year limitation: *Provided*, That this amount shall be treated as a loan to such fund and shall bear interest, payable annually, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury after taking into consideration the average rate of interest payable upon all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States: *Provided further*, That beginning not later than July 1, 1955, such amount shall be paid from such fund into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts at an annual rate of not less than one-tenth of such amount. 48 Stat. 1217. Interest.

Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year. 42 USC ch. 7.

In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, payments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter in the period beginning April 1 of



the prior year, and ending June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to a State plan approved under such title prior to or during such period, but no such payment shall be made with respect to any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which such plan was submitted for approval.

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, \$1,150,000, together with not to exceed \$171,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services: For expenses necessary for the Office of Field Services, \$1,835,000, together with not to exceed \$375,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel: For expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel, \$350,000, together with not to exceed \$22,500 to be transferred from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection services", and not to exceed \$365,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal excess property for educational purposes and protection of public health, \$255,000.

63 Stat. 386.  
40 USC 484.

## REDUCTIONS IN CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

The contract authorization granted under the head "National Heart Institute", in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1950, is hereby reduced by the amount of \$3,124.

63 Stat. 291.

The contract authorization granted under the head "Construction of research facilities, Public Health Service" in title II of the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act of 1950 is hereby reduced by the sum of \$800,000.

63 Stat. 291.

## REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

Amounts available from appropriations are hereby reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Act, except as otherwise indicated:

"Grants to States, municipalities, etc., for plan preparation, water pollution control", \$200,000;

"Research facilities, National Institute of Dental Research" Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1950, \$23,573.49;

63 Stat. 291.

"Payments to States for surveys and programs for hospital construction": The balance remaining unexpended on the date of approval of this Act;

"Grants for surveys and school construction": The balance of the amount appropriated under section 101 of Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, second session (which sum was included under this head in chapter V of the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1951), which is unexpended on December 31, 1953.

64 Stat. 967,  
1051.  
20 USC 251.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for examination of estimates of appropria-

tions in the field, and for payment in advance for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public.

SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

60 Stat. 810.

SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses and not to exceed \$75,000 of such funds shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the functions or activities for which such appropriations are made: *Provided*, That hereafter appropriations to the Public Health Service for salaries and expenses shall be available for reimbursement to commissioned officers of the Service for the use of taxicabs and other means of conveyance (including reimbursement for use of privately owned vehicles) within and around their designated posts of duty, such reimbursement to be on the same basis and subject to the same limitations as for civilian officers and employees, and subject to the approval of the Surgeon General or his authorized agent.

Travel expenses.

Use of taxicabs, etc.

SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated by this title to the Social Security Administration for grants in aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

State agencies for grants-in aid.

SEC. 206. The Secretary is authorized to make such transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices, without transfer of funds, as may be required in carrying out the operations of the Department.

Motor vehicle transfers.

SEC. 207. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury in this title available for salaries and expenses may be transferred to any other such appropriation for the purpose of paying annual leave of employees separated from the service as a result of reductions of appropriations provided herein, but the transfer authority provided herein shall not extend beyond December 31, 1953.

Leave payments.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1954".

Citation of title.

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

National Labor Relations Board Appropriation Act, 1954.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the General Counsel; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$9,125,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as defined in sections 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1060), and including in said

61 Stat. 136.

60 Stat. 810.

61 Stat. 137.  
29 USC 152,  
203.



All 67 Stat. 258.

definition employees engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on a mutual, nonprofit basis and at least 95 per centum of the water stored or supplied thereby is used for farming purposes.

Citation of title.

This title may be cited as the "National Labor Relations Board Appropriation Act, 1954".

National  
Mediation  
Board Approp-  
riation Act,  
1954.  
60 Stat. 810.

#### TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$429,000.

44 Stat. 582,  
586.

Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses necessary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157), and emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant to section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$138,000.

60 Stat. 810.

#### NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$497,000, of which not less than \$181,000 shall be available for compensation (at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of referees appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended.

60 Stat. 810.

45 USC 153.

Citation of title.

This title may be cited as the "National Mediation Board Appropriation Act, 1954".

Railroad Re-  
tirement Board  
Appropriation  
Act, 1954.

#### TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust fund): For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board when specifically authorized by the Board; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, for replacement only; and stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$6,207,000, to be derived from the railroad retirement account.

60 Stat. 810.

#### REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

Payment to railroad retirement account: Appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 and prior fiscal years are hereby reduced by the sum of \$18,656,682, which shall be carried to the surplus of the Treasury.

Citation of title.

This title may be cited as the "Railroad Retirement Board Appropriation Act, 1954".

Federal  
Mediation and  
Conciliation  
Service  
Appropriation  
Act, 1954.

#### TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Rela-

tions Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171-180, 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor relations at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$3,200,000.

61 Stat. 152.  
60 Stat. 810.

Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay necessary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the President pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176-180, 182), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rent in the District of Columbia, \$10,000.

61 Stat. 155.  
60 Stat. 810.

This title may be cited as the "Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1954".

Citation of title.

## TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States, or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Strikes or overthrow of Government.

Affidavit.

Penalty.

SEC. 702. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

Publicity or propaganda.

SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation;

Personnel work.



All 67 Stat. 260.

job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

Short title.

This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Labor and Health Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1954."

Approved July 31, 1953.